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#### Hillary wins now—20% of Republicans vote for Hillary over Trump.

Easley 4/25, (Jason Easley, Politicus USA, “Bombshell Poll: Nearly 20% Of Republicans Will Vote For Hillary Clinton If Trump Wins,” April 25, 2016, http://www.politicususa.com/2016/04/25/bombshell-poll-20-republicans-vote-hillary-clinton-trump-wins.html)

A new Suffolk University poll has found that 19% of Republicans say they will support Hillary Clinton if Donald Trump wins the Republican nomination.¶ The poll contained some numbers that should terrify Republicans. 40% of Republicans polled said that they would not support the party’s nominee if Donald Trump wins. 25% of the anti-Trump Republican vote would consider voting for a third party candidate. 19% of the never Trump Republicans would vote for Hillary Clinton, and 18% would stay home and not vote at all. By gender, 10% of men, and 9% of Republican women would vote for Clinton over Trump. 18% of very likely Republican general election voters would support Hillary Clinton over Donald Trump.¶ These numbers provide just a hint of the potential devastation that nominating Donald Trump could bring to the Republican Party. If Trump’s disapproval ratings continue to climb, it is possible that he could lose half of the Republican electorate. Trump was known by 99% of the voters that were polled, so it is not likely that any kind of image makeover will be effective when he is already universally known.¶ The Republican Party is deeply fractured, and Donald Trump is not the candidate that will bring them together. Trump’s unpopularity will cause many Republicans to stay home, which will result in the GOP losing seats in both the House and the Senate. Trump could cost Republicans state legislatures and governor’s races across the country.¶ Donald Trump is a weapon of mass Republican destruction. The door is open for Hillary Clinton to build a gigantic general election coalition by attracting nearly 20% of Republicans to her campaign. One suspects that we are only beginning to scratch the surface of how bad a Donald Trump nomination will be for the Republican Party.

#### Dem support for handgun bans destroys their electability – there’s a huge difference between gun control and a ban

Christopher 3-24

Bernie Sanders Won’t Make Gun Control a Litmus Test For Supreme Court Nominees

by Tommy Christopher | 3:29 pm, March 24th, 2016 106 Media ITE

Sanders has already been hit hard by Hillary Clinton over gun control, but before you reach for the torches and pitchforks, on this particular question, it’s unclear of there’s any daylight between them. **Hillary has listed numerous litmus tests for Supreme Court picks**, among them the Voting Rights Act and protecting marriage equality, **but not Heller**. During a fundraiser in October, **she did proclaim that “the Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment,” but appeared to be talking about assault weapons**, which gun rights advocates say are covered by Heller because they are “commonly used.” She has also made comments in the past supportive of the idea that gun ownership is an individual right, so it’s not at all clear that she’d make that aspect of Heller a litmus test now. **There is great public support for certain gun control measures, but on the issue of an individual’s right to own a firearm, a litmus test like this would put Hillary and Bernie on the very wrong side of the general electorate.** They could make clarifying the Heller decision’s meaning for assault weapons an issue, but that’s an awfully tough needle to thread.

#### Hilary prioritizes climate change – supported cap and trade and UN’s climate plan

Friedman et al 4/13 (Lisa Friedman, writer for Scientific American, Evan Lehmann, writer for Scientific American, ClimateWire, led by veteran Wall Street Journal reporter John Fialka, and the reporting crew includes additions to our team from award-winning writers who worked at the Houston Chronicle, Denver Post and LA Daily News, “Hillary Clinton May Take a Strong Stance on Global Warming’, Scientific American, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/hillary-clinton-may-take-a-strong-stance-on-global-warming/, 7/5/15, ACC)

**Clinton signaled in September that she will stay apace of Obama's soaring oratory on the impacts of climbing temperatures** (ClimateWire, Sept. 5, 2014). **The president** has **described it as an ever-growing threat with deeper risks to the economy and the environment than perhaps even from disparate terrorist groups**. Clinton also puts it near the top of her priority list. **She described global warming as "the most consequential, urgent, sweeping collection of challenges we face as a nation and a world" at the National Clean Energy Summit** held by Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.). Then**, in December, she locked arms with Obama's climate legacy by vowing to defend U.S. EPA's Clean Power Plan "at all cost"** (Greenwire, July 1, 2014). Some see that as a sign that she'll wage war against Republican climate change deniers in her campaign for the White House, potentially giving climate a higher profile in 2016 than in previous elections. "The science of climate change is unforgiving," Clinton said then. **"No matter what deniers may say, sea levels are rising; ice caps are melting; storms, droughts and wildfires are wreaking havoc." Clinton isn't a recent convert. She proposed a cap-and-trade program in 2007 when she and Obama were dueling to be their party's presidential nominee -- and to be the leader on climate solutions. Her goal was to cut emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050**. That year, in a speech in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, **she reminisced about a trip she had taken to the Alaskan wilderness, where she heard about warming winters from dogsledders, rising seas from villagers and drying lakebeds.** "There are no climate change skeptics inside the Arctic Circle," **Clinton said** then, adding later, "**This is the biggest challenge we have faced in a generation."** Podesta choice sends a strong signal Purvis noted that her tenure as secretary of State was more punctuated by work on womens' empowerment than on energy. But, **he argued, she also found a way to weave those concerns into new climate policies. She put $50 million into a new initiative to encourage families to use cleaner-burning stoves instead of kerosene, wood, dung and other solid fuels as a way to both improve health and cut emissions, focused on helping those hardest hit by climate change. She also spearheaded the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, dedicated to curbing non-carbon-dioxide pollutants that cause global warming. "One has to acknowledge that the issues that probably animate her the most are the rights of women, community empowerment, children and democracy.** But I can't think of a time when she didn't make the right environmental decision," Purvis said. Since leaving office, Clinton has toughened her language. Skeptical Republicans are now described as deniers by Clinton and her party. Paul Bledsoe, a former Clinton White House climate adviser and now a fellow at the German Marshall Fund, noted that the fact Clinton tapped Podesta to run her campaign signals that **she considers climate change a winning campaign issue and a top priority. "I think she's going to run as an economic populist and a defender of the middle class against the depredations of extreme economic inequality**," Bledsoe said. "**Climate fits in because I think she's going to portray the Republicans as willing to put the average American in clear and present danger from climate change**, because the solutions don't fit with the ideological litmus test of the party. "I think she's going to be very aggressive in the campaign as pushing climate change as a part of the 'defender of the little guy' message," Bledsoe said.

#### Extinction.

Schiffman 13 Richard 9/27/13, environmental writer @ The Atlantic citing the Fifth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “What Leading Scientists Want You to Know About Today's Frightening Climate Report,” The Atlantic, <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/09/leading-scientists-weigh-in-on-the-mother-of-all-climate-reports/280045/>

The polar icecaps are melting faster than we thought they would; seas are rising faster than we thought they would; extreme weather events are increasing. Have a nice day! That’s a less than scientifically rigorous summary of the findings of the Fifth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report released this morning in Stockholm.¶ Appearing exhausted after a nearly two sleepless days fine-tuning the language of the report, co-chair Thomas Stocker called climate change “the greatest challenge of our time," adding that “each of the last three decades has been successively warmer than the past,” and that this trend is likely to continue into the foreseeable future.¶ Pledging further action to cut carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said, "This isn’t a run of the mill report to be dumped in a filing cabinet. This isn’t a political document produced by politicians... It’s science."¶ And that science needs to be communicated to the public, loudly and clearly. I canvassed leading climate researchers for their take on the findings of the vastly influential IPCC report. What headline would they put on the news? What do they hope people hear about this report?¶ When I asked him for his headline, Michael Mann, the Director of the Earth Systems Science Center at Penn State (a former IPCC author himself) suggested: "Jury In: Climate Change Real, Caused by Us, and a Threat We Must Deal With."¶ Ted Scambos, a glaciologist and head scientist of the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) based in Boulder would lead with: "IPCC 2013, Similar Forecasts, Better Certainty." While the report, which is issued every six to seven years, offers no radically new or alarming news, Scambos told me, it puts an exclamation point on what we already know, and refines our evolving understanding of global warming.¶ The IPCC, the indisputable rock star of UN documents, serves as the basis for global climate negotiations, like the ones that took place in Kyoto, Rio, and, more recently, Copenhagen. (The next big international climate meeting is scheduled for 2015 in Paris.) It is also arguably the most elaborately vetted and exhaustively researched scientific paper in existence. Founded in 1988 by the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization, the IPCC represents the distilled wisdom of over 600 climate researchers in 32 countries on changes in the Earth’s atmosphere, ice and seas. It endeavors to answer the late New York mayor Ed Koch’s famous question “How am I doing?” for all of us. The answer, which won’t surprise anyone who has been following the climate change story, is not very well at all. ¶ It is now 95 percent likely that human spewed heat-trapping gases — rather than natural variability — are the main cause of climate change, according to today’s report. In 2007 the IPCC’s confidence level was 90 percent, and in 2001 it was 66 percent, and just over 50 percent in 1995. ¶ What’s more, things are getting worse more quickly than almost anyone thought would happen a few years back.¶ “If you look at the early IPCC predictions back from 1990 and what has taken place since, climate change is proceeding faster than we expected,” Mann told me by email. Mann helped develop the famous hockey-stick graph, which Al Gore used in his film “An Inconvenient Truth” to dramatize the sharp rise in temperatures in recent times. ¶ Mann cites the decline of Arctic sea ice to explain : “Given the current trajectory, we're on track for ice-free summer conditions in the Arctic in a matter of a decade or two... There is a similar story with the continental ice sheets, which are losing ice — and contributing to sea level rise — at a faster rate than the [earlier IPCC] models had predicted.”¶ But there is a lot that we still don’t understand. Reuters noted in a sneak preview of IPCC draft which was leaked in August that, while the broad global trends are clear, climate scientists were “finding it harder than expected to predict the impact in specific regions in coming decades.”¶ From year to year, the world’s hotspots are not consistent, but move erratically around the globe. The same has been true of heat waves, mega-storms and catastrophic floods, like the recent ones that ravaged the Colorado Front Range. There is broad agreement that climate change is increasing the severity of extreme weather events, but we’re not yet able to predict where and when these will show up. ¶ “It is like watching a pot boil,” Danish astrophysicist and climate scientist Peter Thejll told me. “We understand why it boils but cannot predict where the next bubble will be.”¶ There is also uncertainty about an apparent slowdown over the last decade in the rate of air temperature increase. While some critics claim that global warming has “stalled,” others point out that, when rising ocean temperatures are factored in, the Earth is actually gaining heat faster than previously anticipated.¶ “Temperatures measured over the short term are just one parameter,” said Dr Tim Barnett of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography in an interview. “There are far more critical things going on; the acidification of the ocean is happening a lot faster than anybody thought that it would, it’s sucking up more CO2, plankton, the basic food chain of the planet, are dying, it’s such a hugely important signal. Why aren’t people using that as a measure of what is going on?”¶ Barnett thinks that recent increases in volcanic activity, which spews smog-forming aerosols into the air that deflect solar radiation and cool the atmosphere, might help account for the temporary slowing of global temperature rise. But he says we shouldn’t let short term fluctuations cause us to lose sight of the big picture.¶ The dispute over temperatures underscores just how formidable the IPCC’s task of modeling the complexity of climate change is. Issued in three parts (the next two installments are due out in the spring), the full version of the IPCC will end up several times the length of Leo Tolstoy’s epic War and Peace. Yet every last word of the U.N. document needs to be signed off on by all of the nations on earth. ¶ “I do not know of any other area of any complexity and importance at all where there is unanimous agreement... and the statements so strong,” Mike MacCracken, Chief Scientist for Climate Change Programs, Climate Institute in Washington, D.C. told me in an email. “What IPCC has achieved is remarkable (and why it merited the Nobel Peace Prize granted in 2007).”¶ Not surprisingly, the IPCC’s conclusions tend to be “conservative by design,” Ken Caldeira, an atmospheric scientist with the Carnegie Institution’s Department of Global Ecology told me: “The IPCC is not supposed to represent the controversial forefront of climate science. It is supposed to represents what nearly all scientists agree on, and it does that quite effectively.”¶ Nevertheless, even these understated findings are inevitably controversial. Roger Pielke Jr., the Director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado, Boulder suggested a headline that focuses on the cat fight that today’s report is sure to revive: "Fresh Red Meat Offered Up in the Climate Debate, Activists and Skeptics Continue Fighting Over It." Pielke should know. A critic of Al Gore, who has called his own detractors "climate McCarthyists," Pielke has been a lightning rod for the political controversy which continues to swirl around the question of global warming, and what, if anything, we should do about it. ¶ The public’s skepticism of climate change took a dive after Hurricane Sandy. Fifty-four percent of Americans are now saying that the effects of global warming have already begun. But 41 percent surveyed in the same Gallup poll believe news about global warming is generally exaggerated, and there is a smaller but highly passionate minority that continues to believe the whole thing is a hoax. ¶ For most climate experts, however, the battle is long over — at least when it comes to the science. What remains in dispute is not whether climate change is happening, but how fast things are going to get worse.¶ There are some possibilities that are deliberately left out of the IPCC projections, because we simply don’t have enough data yet to model them. Jason Box, a visiting scholar at the Byrd Polar Research Center told me in an email interview that: “The scary elephant in the closet is terrestrial and oceanic methane release triggered by warming.” The IPCC projections don’t include the possibility — some scientists say likelihood — that huge quantities of methane (a greenhouse gas thirty times as potent as CO2) will eventually be released from thawing permafrost and undersea methane hydrate reserves. Box said that the threshhold “when humans lose control of potential management of the problem, may be sooner than expected.”¶ Box, whose work has been instrumental in documenting the rapid deterioration of the Greenland ice sheet, also believes that the latest IPCC predictions (of a maximum just under three foot ocean rise by the end of the century) may turn out to be wildly optimistic, if the Greenland ice sheet breaks up. “We are heading into uncharted territory” he said. “We are creating a different climate than the Earth has ever seen.” ¶ The head of the IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri, speaks for the scientific consensus when he says that time is fast running out to avoid the catastrophic collapse of the natural systems on which human life depends. What he recently told a group of climate scientist could be the most chilling headline of all for the U.N. report: ¶ "We have five minutes before midnight."

## Uniqueness

### 1NR Uniqueness Wall

#### Hillary will win: Easeley evidence from 4 days ago cites comprehensive poll data and says 20% of Republicans will defect to Hillary if Trump gets elected. Massive anti-Trump sentiment is creating a demographic shift that favors centrist candidates, creating a massive general election coalition.

#### Hillary wins now—negative partisanship unites Dems against Trump, polls prove

Huey-Burns 4/25, (Caitlin Huey-Burns, Real Clear Politics Apr 25, 2016, “Hillary Clinton May Be the One Candidate Who Can Unite the Republican Party,” http://www.haaretz.com/world-news/u-s-election-2016/1.716313)

While the visceral reaction among Republicans to Hillary Clinton is extraordinary, it’s part of a concept known among political scientists as “negative partisanship.” And it’s pervading American politics, in the opinion of many.¶ “There’s an increasing percentage of voters in both parties who have very strong negative feelings about the opposing party,” says Emory University professor Alan Abramowitz. “And it occurs even while their feelings toward their own party aren’t positive, as is the case especially on the Republican side, which is fueling the campaigns of Trump and Cruz.” ¶ The main effect, Abramowitz says, is the highest level of party loyalty and straight ticket voting since tracking began over 60 years ago. ¶ “There’s a growing tendency to see those in the other party as people you don’t want to associate with--it goes beyond disagreement, where those in the other party are seen as bad people” he says. “The implication is you wouldn’t vote for them under any circumstances.”¶ The test case for this theory, of course, could be Trump.¶ Democrats argue that Trump’s candidacy will galvanize their party in support of Clinton, assuming she becomes the nominee. While the Democratic primary became longer and more contentious with the rise and popularity of Bernie Sanders, some analysts say the divide can be bridged by opposition to Republicans, whom Democrats will paint with a broad brush in the colors of Trump and Cruz. ¶ “There is such negative energy around both those candidates that whatever positive energy exists inside the GOP to stop Hillary Clinton will be diminished,” says Democratic strategist Doug Thornell. “The general election is not going to be a cake walk for a Democrat, but if the only hope Republicans have is they are going to rally against Clinton’s candidacy, that speaks to the larger problems they have.” ¶ Both Democrats and Republicans agree that in an era of such negative partisanship, crossover appeal is less and less likely. While Trump may be attracting disaffected Democrats, most of them working-class whites, there may be enough Republicans who won’t vote for him to cancel out the new voters. And Republicans who won’t support Trump or who are averse to Cruz aren’t likely to support Clinton, given their intense opposition to her. Instead, they would likely write in a candidate or stay home.¶ Lindsey Graham underscored the unlikelihood of cross-party voting when he backed his Senate enemy, Cruz. Davis, the Republican strategist, noted that McCain had a roughly 30 percent favorability rating among Democrats and still didn't pull them over in the general election.¶ John Kasich has built his entire campaign on the idea that he could beat Clinton in the fall, and hypothetical matchups show he is the only current candidate who stands a chance. Clinton leads Cruz and Trump in polls.

#### Hillary beats Trump absent a major opinion shift.

Stromberg 4/27. (Stephen Stromberg is a Post editorial writer. He specializes in domestic policy, including energy, the environment, legal affairs and public health. He first joined the Post editorial page in 2006, before he spent 2007 and 2008 covering the presidential election and the Great Recession for The Economist. No, Donald Trump, beating Hillary Clinton will not be easy for you. April 27, 2016. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2016/04/27/no-donald-trump-beating-hillary-clinton-will-not-be-easy-for-you/>. MMG)

Following a five-primary sweep Tuesday night, Donald Trump repeatedly insisted that he would beat Hillary Clinton “so easily,” because she is a crooked politician and a flawed candidate whom people do not like. It is undoubtedly true that Clinton is beatable. By her own admission, she is “not a natural politician.” But that does not mean that Trump can beat her, let alone easily. Trump offered a few arguments for his electability in his Tuesday victory speech. He made the familiar case that he would attract votes from white, working-class men. He talked about traveling around New York and seeing hollowed-out industrial towns. He reminded his audience that Bill Clinton signed the North American Free Trade Agreement, which he linked to the economic hardship among blue-collar workers. With his usual lack of detail, he insisted that he would force companies to stop outsourcing manufacturing jobs. Taking his populism in a slightly new direction, he made a play for Bernie Sanders voters, talking about how Clinton “is funded by Wall Street” and insisting that “The Democrats have treated Bernie very badly.” He also painted Clinton as incompetent. “She knows nothing about jobs, except jobs for herself,” he said. “She doesn’t have the strength, she doesn’t have the stamina…to deal with China or other things.” Trump predicted that he would put states such as New York in play in the general election. This is a fantasy. It is highly unlikely that white working class Democrats who have not already defected to the Republican Party are likely to do so now. After reviewing survey data, political scientist Charlotte Cavaillé concluded that, rather than causing a defection of blue-collar Democrats into his camp, Trump is mostly benefiting from defections that have already happened. His only hope would be “dramatically increasing the turnout among the younger and politically unaffiliated white working class,” she concluded. Given that Trump is the least popular candidate among the general public, with poor favorability numbers even among white men, that probably would not be enough. Trump would have to use gains among blue-collar voters to offset losses among minorities and women, among others. He did little to offer minority voters, particularly Latinos, a reason to change their feelings toward him Tuesday night, repeating his familiar talking points on immigration. But he did discuss women. As usual, he insisted that he would be great for women. But then he said this about Clinton: “The only card she has is the women’s card.” He insisted that she would not get 5 percent of the vote if she were a man. It is not clear whether he was trying to appeal to women or men. It could be that he wants to stoke resentment among men who see talk of women’s issues as inappropriate identity politics. But he could also be attempting to stoke resentment among women who feel as though Clinton expects them to vote for her based on their shared gender, a sentiment that circulated among some Sanders voters during the New Hampshire primaries. His conclusion hinted at the latter intent: “The beautiful thing is, women don’t like her,” Trump said. Except women really don’t like Trump. A recent NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll found that 69 percent of women view the GOP frontrunner negatively. His campaign appears to believe that he can turn his negatives around. But his numbers are historically bad. Trump may think that he can fool most of the people, but he has only shown that he can fool some of the people. Trump is right that Clinton is a vulnerable opponent. What he does not realize, or does not admit, is that he is even weaker.

### AT Uniqueness Overwhelms the Link

#### No it doesn’t:

#### 1. Easely says Hillary has the opportunity to grab votes but they aren’t guaranteed—massive coalitional support is key.

#### 3. The Lazaroff evidence says that there is an 8/9 chance Hillary loses if Obama support dips below 40—history proves.

#### Nonuniques any risk of aff offense—if we win the majority of the case debate or turns case vote neg on the disadvantage.

#### Hillary is the favorite, but that doesn’t mean Trump can’t win—his vagueness on policy platforms means he can jump on a Clinton misstep and win the election.

Rahn 4/28, (Will Rahn is a political correspondent and managing director, politics, for CBS News Digital, “Commentary: Yes, Donald Trump can beat Hillary Clinton,” April 28, 2016, http://www.cbsnews.com/news/yes-trump-can-beat-hillary-clinton/)

Hillary's weak points aside, Trump also has one main advantage, which is that he'd be probably the most moderate nominee in decades. Now, Trump is not normally what we think of when we think of moderates - "reactionary moderate" is perhaps the best term to describe him. But border walls and Muslim bans aside, Trump really most closely resembles an old-school northeastern centrist Republican. Trump likes the welfare state. He's made protecting entitlements central to his pitch. It's safe to say that he's likely, at heart, socially liberal -- the story of how he became anti-abortion, for example, doesn't make a great deal of sense. (That story, in brief: friends of his debated having an abortion. They did not. The kid turned out to be "a winner." When pressed if he would have stayed pro-abortion if the kid was a loser, Trump once replied "probably not.")¶ He clearly doesn't like these "Bathroom Bills" popping up in red states; bad for business, and that's always Trump's bottom line. Regardless of what he says in the lead-up to next week's Indiana primary, that probably goes for RFRAs as well. And given the milieu he's always existed in, it's hard to believe he really opposes gay marriage, either.¶ Trump has had the benefit of never really fleshing out what he believes about specific policies; nearly a year into his campaign, we still don't know what he'd replace Obamacare with. He is, as his longtime advisor Roger Stone says, a "big picture" guy: pro-business, pro-military, pro-America. The rest is all open to negotiation, to making the best deal.¶ And, as Jim Antle notes over at The Washington Examiner, that puts him pretty squarely into the vast middle of the American electorate. "The New American Center", as NBC News recently called it, is patriotic. It thinks America is the best country in the world. But it hates our political system and our elites. It doesn't like immigration or Affirmative Action or other programs explicitly designed to help minorities.¶ It is, in other words, Trump's natural base, at least on paper. Now, there are still plenty of reasons why someone who agrees with Trump on a whole mess of issues might still be unwilling to vote for him. But it's a mistake to assume that the man doesn't have a natural constituency outside the GOP.¶ There are a lot of "ifs" in all this. Trump can alienate his own base if he triangulates too much between now and Election Day. His seeming inability to set up any kind of nationwide infrastructure might alone doom him in a race with Clinton. Voters just might decide that they really do hate the guy and will do anything from seeing him become president. There are endless variables here, and Clinton should be considered the odds-on favorite for the presidency.¶ But that doesn't mean Trump doesn't have a chance. He does.

### AT Clinton Loses Primary

#### Clinton beats Sanders—his support is dwindling and he can’t affect delegate counts in any meaningful way.

Seitz-Wald 4/27, (Alex Seitz-Wald, NBC News, Clinton Victories Spell Beginning of the End for Sanders, April 27, 2016, http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/clinton-victories-spell-beginning-end-sanders-n563261)

PHILADELPHIA — Onstage in a city where she will in all likelihood will be crowned the Democratic presidential nominee in July, Hillary Clinton on Tuesday moved to embrace Bernie Sanders' supporters as she expanded her already significant delegate lead in the day's primaries.¶ "With your help, we're going to come back to Philadelphia for the Democratic National Convention," Clinton said to supporters. "We will unify our party to win this election."¶ With five Northeast states voting Tuesday, Clinton easily won the two biggest prizes of the night: Pennsylvania and Maryland. She also took home Delaware and Connecticut in tighter races. By 12:15 a.m. ET, NBC News put Clinton at 2,117 delegates and Sanders at 1,330. The nomination requires 2,383 delegates.¶ The added delegates create a virtually unbridgeable gap for Sanders, who had already moved on to West Virginia, which holds its primary May 10.¶ Sanders found a silver lining Tuesday in Rhode Island, where he notched a victory in the nation's smallest state. It's not much, and worth little in terms of delegates, but his disheartened supporters will happily take it.¶ The former secretary of state in her victory speech struck a much more magnanimous tone than she had during an MSNBC town hall the night before. There, she said it was Sanders' job — not hers — to bring his supporters into the fold and made it clear she had little interest in meeting them halfway.¶ On Tuesday, Clinton not only praised her rival but elevated his issues and made common cause with his voters.¶ "I applaud Senator Sanders and his millions of supporters," she said.¶ She ticked through his core issues — curbing big money in politics and economic inequality, addressing climate change — and explained they are her priorities, too.¶ "In this election, we will have to stand together and work hard to prevail over candidates on the other side," Clinton said. "And I know together we will get that done."¶ She put no pressure on Sanders supporters to fall in line, and Clinton aides acknowledge it will take time for wounds to heal. Some know the feeling personally from when Clinton lost in 2008 to Barack Obama and slowly, grudgingly, came around to the one-time rival.¶ With her lock on the nomination now virtually secure, the rest of her speech, a sunny vision of a brighter future, was ready-made for the general election.¶ Clinton also got a taste of what she can expect in a general election against GOP front-runner Donald Trump. "The only card she has is the women's card. She's got nothing else going," he said at his election party at Trump Tower in New York City. "And, frankly, if Hillary Clinton were a man, I don't think she'd get 5 percent of the vote."¶ Meanwhile, Sanders addressed more than 6,400 people and made it clear he has no interest in dropping out. Notably, he spoke about his campaign as a movement with more important goals than winning.¶ "This campaign is not just about electing a president, it is about transforming a nation," he said to cheers. "The fight that we are waging is not easy fight, but I know you are prepared to wage that fight against the one percent, against the billionaire class."¶ In a statement late Tuesday, Sanders once again said he's still in this race until the last vote is cast, but also seemed to have one eye on things he would like added to the Democratic Party's platform.¶ "This campaign is going to the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia with as many delegates as possible to fight for a progressive party platform," he said, listing items he wants included.¶ Some of supporters seem to be at least beginning to come to grips with the end.¶ Democracy for America, one of the main groups backing Sanders, suggested the goal is no longer winning, but respect.¶ "The question right now isn't whether the movement behind Bernie Sanders is going to continue winning delegates and states in the weeks ahead, it's whether the Democratic establishment is going to bring our party together by embracing our fight," said Charles Chamberlain, the group's executive director.¶ Democratic voters overwhelming said they have found the primary contest thus far energizing rather than divisive, according to NBC News exit polls of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Connecticut.¶ Sanders supporters were far more likely to find it divisive, with 37 percent picking that response, versus 12 percent of Clinton supporters.¶ The road ahead improves for Sanders, with upcoming contests where the Vermont senator is expected to perform well.¶ Even so, the small handful of states that vote in May offer little more than opportunities for moral victories, since none are large enough to affect the delegate race in any meaningful way.

#### Sanders will drop out and throw his support behind Clinton—he will do everything he can to stop Trump.

Milbank 4/27, (Dana Milbank, Washington Post Writers Group, “Commentary: Why Bernie Sanders will ultimately support Hillary Clinton,” April 27, 2016, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-bernie-sanders-will-endorse-hillary-clinton-eventually-20160427-story.html)

Why the hysteria? It doesn't matter if Sanders continues his candidacy until the last votes are cast in June. What matters is that he quits gracefully, and there should be every expectation that he will, for a simple reason: Sanders is not a fool.¶ Sanders showed no sign of retreat Tuesday night, even as Clinton extended her lead by winning the night's biggest prize, Pennsylvania, as well as Maryland, Delaware and Connecticut; Sanders won only Rhode Island. He gave a defiant, hour-long speech in which he said he was “taking on the most powerful political organization in America.” The reference to Clinton drew boos.¶ Sanders sounded like an extortionist Monday night when he said Clinton, if she won the nomination, would have to earn his supporters' votes by embracing single-payer health care, free college tuition and a carbon tax — all things Clinton rejected in her (successful) campaign against Sanders. But seconds later, Sanders, prodded by the moderator, MSNBC's Chris Hayes, added a qualifier: “I will do everything in my power to make sure that no Republican gets into the White House in this election cycle.”¶ That's the crucial part. Sanders wants to exert maximum leverage to move Clinton toward his populist policies. But he is a practical man, and he certainly doesn't wish to see a President Donald Trump or President Ted Cruz. This is why there's no cause for all the fuss over him remaining in the race until he is mathematically eliminated.¶ Elimination is coming. Even before Clinton padded her lead with Tuesday night's wins, Sanders needed to win 59 percent of remaining delegates, or 71 percent if you include superdelegates. That isn't going to happen.¶ Clinton loyalists worry that Clinton will suffer general election consequences from Sanders' suggestions that she is unqualified and in Wall Street's pocket. And Trump has echoed these attacks and said he'd like Sanders “to keep going.”¶ Still, this doesn't qualify as ugly campaigning — particularly compared with a Republican race in which candidates have called each other liars and argued about genital size. Or compare it with the Obama-Clinton standoff of 2008 — a much closer contest. At a May 31, 2008, meeting of the Democratic National Committee, the two campaigns clashed with accusations of cheating. There were hecklers, howls and foul language, and extra security had to be called in to keep order. At the time, Clinton aides, sounding much like this year's Sanders aides, were threatening that Obama “has work to do” to convince Clinton backers to go his way.¶ But a week later, Clinton was out, and the party was on a path to unity.¶ And so it will happen this time. Sanders, when he quits the race, can justifiably declare victory in moving the debate — and Clinton — in his direction on his key issues. His campaign has exceeded all expectations, and he isn't about to jeopardize his movement by handing the presidency to Trump.

#### Hillary beats Bernie by defending Obama.

Tures 2/12. (John A. Tures is a professor of political science at LaGrange College in LaGrange, Ga. Hillary Clinton Won The Debate With Sanders By Defending Barack Obama. February 12, 2016. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-a-tures/hillary-clinton-won-the-d_b_9215736.html>. MMG)

As someone who has attended Bernie Sanders rallies and written about his impressive candidacy, I expected him to prevail in the Milwaukee debate. But Hillary Clinton prevailed by going to the mat for her former boss. Early in the debate, Vermont Senator Sanders took the early lead on Wall Street and Clinton’s connections to that group. But Hillary Clinton climbed back in it pointing out the discrepancy between Sanders’ claims of opposition to regime change and his record in voting for it. Claiming “it was unanimous” didn’t help Sanders’ case. So it came down to the wire, with both evenly matched. Then both candidates were asked to name good examples of leaders. Sanders mentioned FDR and Winston Churchill. Clinton noted FDR and Nelson Mandela briefly, but pivoted to a defense of President Barack Obama, adding that Sanders had criticized the Democratic President. It was the first time I had ever seen Sanders rattled. The heated exchange went like this**: [CONTNUES AFTER A TRANSCRIPT FROM THE MILWAUKEE DEBATE]** Sanders got only tepid applause at best for that last line, because voters recognize that Hillary Clinton was running for president in 2008, not trying to stop Obama. But by calling for a primary opponent for Obama in 2012, that was a different story, one which could have sunk the Democratic Party’s chances. Nothing takes out a president like a primary opponent. Sure, Sanders didn’t slam Obama personally in his foreword to the Bill Press book Buyer’s Remorse. But the book blasted Obama, and Sanders had to know what the book was about. If not, he should have asked at least. But he didn’t. Clinton is right on this one. Obama took plenty of abuse from Republicans. The last thing Obama needed was friendly fire when trying to muster support for initiatives that Sanders otherwise claims to support. By making the nomination a referendum on Obama, Secretary Clinton should shore up her support among Democrats who realize what the president has done for the party, instead of those who complain he didn’t do anything for Democrats.

### AT TPP Kills Hillary

TEXT: The Executive Branch of the United States should withdraw the Trans Pacific Partnership.

#### Solves the thumper.

Johnson 4/11. (Dave Johnson is a Fellow with Campaign for America's Future and a Senior Fellow with Renew California. Dave is founder and principal author at Seeing the Forest, and a blogger at Speak Out California. He is a frequent public speaker, talk-radio personality and a leading participant in the progressive blogging community. Before starting Seeing the Forest, Dave had over 20 years of technology industry experience. Recently he helped co-found Carbon Tracing, Inc., the company developing the desktop systems to validate carbon trading in the US. He previously held senior industry positions including CEO and VP of Sales and Marketing. Clinton Should Ask Obama To Withdraw The TPP. April 11, 2016. <https://ourfuture.org/20160411/clinton-should-ask-obama-to-withdraw-tpp>. MMG)

Reports like this only serve to further undermine Clinton’s credibility on TPP. Clinton is seen as the “establishment” candidate, and is described in the media as “hugging the Obama agenda,” “bear-hugging Obama,” “embracing Obama ‘as close as she can’” and other similar descriptions. Obama’s push for TPP therefore harms Clinton as she tries to be seen by voters as the Obama successor. Voters hate the TPP. Having that threat of its passage after the election hanging out there only harms Clinton in the eyes of the electorate. Candidate Clinton has an opportunity to address her TPP credibility problem by asking Obama to withdraw TPP from consideration by Congress, and calling on her supporters and endorsers in Congress to join her in demanding that the agreement be withdrawn.

### AT Trump Loses Primary – Generic

#### It will be Trump v Hillary.

Krugman 4/29. (Paul Krugman joined The New York Times in 1999 as an Op-Ed columnist. He is distinguished professor in the Graduate Center Economics Ph.D. program and distinguished scholar at the Luxembourg Income Study Center at the City University of New York. In addition, he is professor emeritus of Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School. In 2008, Mr. Krugman was the sole recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences for his work on international trade theory. Mr. Krugman received his B.A. from Yale University in 1974 and his Ph.D. from M.I.T. in 1977. He has taught at Yale, M.I.T. and Stanford. At M.I.T. he became the Ford International Professor of Economics. Mr. Krugman is the author or editor of 27 books and more than 200 papers in professional journals and edited volumes. Wrath of the Conned. April 29, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/opinion/wrath-of-the-conned.html?_r=1>. MMG)

Maybe we need a new cliché: It ain’t over until Carly Fiorina sings. Anyway, it really is over — definitively on the Democratic side, with high probability on the Republican side. And the results couldn’t be more different. Think about where we were a year ago. At the time, Hillary Clinton and Jeb Bush were widely seen as the front-runners for their parties’ nods. If there was any dissent from the commentariat, it came from those suggesting that Mr. Bush might be supplanted by a fresher, but still establishment, face, like Marco Rubio. And now here we are. But why did Mrs. Clinton, despite the most negative media coverage of any candidate in this cycle — yes, worse than Donald Trump’s — go the distance, while the G.O.P. establishment went down to humiliating defeat? Personalities surely played a role; say what you like (or dislike) about Mrs. Clinton, but she’s resilient under pressure, a character trait notably lacking on the other side. But basically it comes down to fundamental differences between the parties and how they serve their supporters. Both parties make promises to their bases. But while the Democratic establishment more or less tries to make good on those promises, the Republican establishment has essentially been playing bait-and-switch for decades. And voters finally rebelled against the con. First, about the Democrats: Their party defines itself as the protector of the poor and the middle class, and especially of nonwhite voters. Does it fall short of fulfilling this mission much of the time? Are its leaders sometimes too close to big-money donors? Of course. Still, if you look at the record of the Obama years, you see real action on behalf of the party’s goals. Above all, you have the Affordable Care Act, which has given about 20 million Americans health insurance, with the gains biggest for the poor, minorities and low-wage workers. That’s what you call delivering for the base — and it’s surely one reason nonwhite voters have overwhelmingly favored Mrs. Clinton over a challenger who sometimes seemed to dismiss that achievement. And this was paid for largely with higher taxes on the rich, with average tax rates on very high incomes rising by about six percentage points since 2008. Maybe you think Democrats could and should have done more, but what the party establishment says and what it does are at least roughly aligned. Things are very different among Republicans. Their party has historically won elections by appealing to racial enmity and cultural anxiety, but its actual policy agenda is dedicated to serving the interests of the 1 percent, above all through tax cuts for the rich — which even Republican voters don’t support, while they truly loathe elite ideas like privatizing Social Security and Medicare. What Donald Trump has been doing is telling the base that it can order à la carte. He has, in effect, been telling aggrieved white men that they can feed their anger without being forced to swallow supply-side economics, too. Yes, his actual policy proposals still involve huge tax cuts for the rich, but his supporters don’t know that — and it’s possible that he doesn’t, either. Details aren’t his thing. Establishment Republicans have tried to counter his appeal by shouting, with growing hysteria, that he isn’t a true conservative. And they’re right, at least as they define conservatism. But their own voters don’t care. If there’s a puzzle here, it’s why this didn’t happen sooner. One possible explanation is the decadence of the G.O.P. establishment, which has become ingrown and lost touch. Apparatchiks who have spent their whole careers inside the bubble of right-wing think tanks and partisan media may suffer from the delusion that their ideology is actually popular with real people. And this has left them hapless in the face of a Trumpian challenge.

### At Trump Loses Primary – Ryan

#### Paul Ryan took himself out of the running—he won’t intervene if Trump gets the nomination.

Martosko 3/16, (David Martosko, US Political Editor for Daily Mail, “Paul Ryan 'will not accept a nomination' for president – even in a contested convention where the GOP needs help escaping a 'Trumpertantrum,'” March 16, 2016, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3495674/Paul-Ryan-not-accept-nomination-president-contested-convention-GOP-needs-help-escaping-Trumpertantrum.html)

House Speaker Paul Ryan is taking himself out of consideration for the Republican presidential nomination, even if the party's July convention turns into utter chaos and needs a consensus candidate to calm the waters of a Trumpertantrum.¶ As front-runner Donald Trump warned Wednesday about 'riots' that could turn ugly if he arrives in Cleveland, Ohio with the most delegates but is denied the nomination, rumors swirled that the popular Wisconsin congressman could emerge as part of a GOP face-saving maneuver.¶ But Ryan's spokeswoman, AshLee Strong, said in a statement on Wednesday that 'the speaker is grateful for the support, but he is not interested. He will not accept a nomination and believes our nominee should be someone who ran this year.'

### At Trump Loses Primary – Fiorina Saves Cruz

#### There is no way Fiorina saves Cruz. Harsanyi 4/28. (David Harsanyi is a senior editor at The Federalist. Harsanyi is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of three books. His work has appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Weekly Standard, National Review, Reason, New York Post, and numerous other publications. David has appeared on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, NPR, ABC World News Tonight, NBC Nightly News and dozens of radio talk shows across the country. Carly Fiorina Is Impressive. But She Can’t Save Cruz. April 28, 2016. <http://thefederalist.com/2016/04/28/carly-fiorina-is-impressive-but-she-cant-save-cruz/>. MMG)

Whenever writing about Donald Trump’s march towards the nomination, it’s become routine for many of us to insert—always with a faint hint of pleading—phrases like “but Ted Cruz still has time.” But does he, really? The Ted Cruz-Carly Fiorina ticket might be a great one in any ordinary political year. But this is Year Zero for the GOP, and having happy thoughts do not move votes. Now, I’m often wrong. So I hope I’m wrong this time, as well. We’ll know more after Indiana, where Cruz is reportedly down by double digits in his internal polling. But as my colleague Ben Domenech pointed out in The Transom this week, Trump is now the presumptive GOP nominee. Cruz’s effectiveness has been in decline over the past few weeks, while rank-and-file voters seem to be coalescing around the frontrunner, as they often do. Trump is now outperforming polls. No matter how inexplicable or dumb his message becomes—or maybe because of it—he marches forward. So will Fiorina, who is by most measures more impressive than Trump, help change this dynamic? There are a number of reasons to be skeptical she will, including the following. The move exudes desperation, not fight. If this is a last-ditch effort to save a campaign, it’s not remarkable enough. Although it’s a tricky to poll, it’s likely that vice presidential nominees make little difference in a general elections (even in their home states). So it seems implausible that Fiorina will shake up this GOP primary/reality show in any significant way. Some voters may see it as another trick being pulled by the (newly minted) “establishment slicker” Cruz. One poll of Carly in Indiana had her at 3 percent around the time she left the GOP race. Maybe she’ll steer some undecided Republican women into the Cruz camp. But perhaps it escapes our attention that a Bobby Knight is probably worth more than a Carly Fiorina in Indiana. Now, if Fiorina has been recruited to help Cruz win California, it would make more sense if she was actually popular in that state. She is not. Even at the height of her surge last year, she was polling behind Trump in the state. Will there be enough undecideds willing to align with a candidate because of a presumptive vice presidential pick in a primary? Seems doubtful.

### AT Trump Loses Primary – Cruz/Kasich Alliance

#### Cruz and Kasich alliance can’t stop Donald.

Simon 4/25. (Roger L. Simon is an Academy Award-nominated screenwriter, award-winning novelist and blogger, and the co-founder of PJ Media. The Republican Convention Will Not Be Contested. April 25, 2016. <https://pjmedia.com/diaryofamadvoter/2016/04/25/the-republican-convention-will-not-be-contested/2/>. MMG)

So the fat lady's been singing for a while. But she started to hit the high notes when, just the other day, Cruz and Kasich got more desperate and decided to team up (sorta) to defeat Trump. They didn't, however, seem to have their hearts in it and only hours after the announcement Kasich appeared to be backing halfway out, saying he still wanted his supporters to vote for him. He just wasn't going to campaign in Indiana. Cruz wasn't acting particularly enthusiastic either. This wasn't exactly the Bryan Brothers going for that last Wimbledon. No real team play for these guys. Trump called them "colluders," but I'm not sure they could do a good job of even sharing crayons. Did they know deep down that Donald already had it? The opposition seems to. Hillary Clinton isn't obsessing aloud every chance she gets on how she's going to defeat John Kasich and she doesn't give Cruz much of a mention either, except as an afterthought, someone to lump in with Trump as an evil conservative. Hillary, at least, doesn't think Donald's a liberal, no matter what contributions he may have made to her campaigns or foundation. She's already making campaign ads attacking him.

### AT Too Early to Predict

#### Moody’s says Clinton wins but Obama’s approval rating is key.

White 4/4, (Dan White, Moody’s Analytics, “Another Tick in the Democrats’ Direction,” April 4, 2016, https://www.economy.com/dismal/topics/election-model)

The Moody’s Analytics election model has been updated to reflect the March economic forecast, and the needle has moved further in the direction of the Democratic party. On strength in the president’s approval rating and low gasoline prices, Nevada has moved from the Republican column into the Democratic column. This brings the projected electoral vote count to 332 votes for the future Democratic nominee and 206 votes for the Republican nominee. However, several important swing states remain extremely close. Nevada, Ohio, Colorado, Virginia, Florida and New Hampshire could all swing very easily with only small changes to the underlying economic drivers.

#### Moody’s economic models predict a Clinton presidency when Obama’s approval ratings are factored in—they’ve been right in every general election since 1980

Sweet 15, (Ryan Sweet, The Street, “Democrats to Win in a Landslide in 2016, According to Moody's Election Model,” August 31, 2015, http://www.thestreet.com/story/13271435/1/democrats-to-win-in-a-landslide-in-2016-according-to-moody-s-election-model.html)

Our Moody's Analytics election model now predicts a Democratic electoral landslide in the 2016 presidential vote. A small change in the forecast data in August has swung the outcome from the statistical tie predicted in July, to a razor-edge ballot outcome that nevertheless gives the incumbent party 326 electoral votes to the Republican challenger's 212. ¶ Just three states account for the change in margin, with Ohio, Florida and Colorado swinging from leaning Republican to leaning Democrat. The margin of victory in each of these important swing states is still solidly within the margin of error though, and will likely swing back and forth in Moody's monthly updates ahead, underlining the closeness of the election to come. Furthermore, three of the candidates for the Republican nomination enjoy favorite-son status in Ohio or Florida, potentially making the outcome of those important states even more unpredictable.¶ It takes 270 electoral votes to win a U.S. presidential election. Our July forecast predicted a Democratic win with 270 electoral votes, to 268 for the Republican, regardless of who wins either party's nomination. Read More: Deep Dive Into Moody's Model.¶ The primary factor driving the results further to the incumbent party in August is lower gasoline prices. Plummeting prices and changing dynamics in global energy markets from Chinese weakness and the Iranian nuclear deal have caused us to significantly lower our gasoline price forecast for the next several years. This variable is very significant to voter sentiment in the model, with lower prices favoring incumbents.¶ It is important to note that the model does not reflect results if an election were held today, but relies on Moody's Analytics economic forecasts to determine what the world will look like in November 2016. Should gasoline prices rebound above the current baseline forecast by election time, the results of the model will move more in favor of the challenging Republicans. The forecast for house prices also accelerated moderately.¶ The election model's other main drivers saw little to no change from the previous month. No new historical data were available for real personal income per household, though September's quarterly update from the Bureau of Economic Analysis has potential to swing the model back toward the challengers if data come in weaker than forecast. The president's approval rating was unchanged from the previous forecast update; however, given the recent volatility in equity markets and what is expected to prove an extremely contentious debate surrounding the Iranian nuclear deal, this factor also has the potential to swing the forecast by next month.¶ The Moody's Analytics Presidential Election model forecasts whether or not the incumbent party will maintain control over the White House using a mixture of economic, demographic and political data. The model successfully predicts every election back to 1980, including a perfect electoral vote prediction in the 2012 election.

#### Predictions markets also predict a Clinton win—avoids pitfalls of bad predictions and polls.

Light 3/28, (Larry Light, CBS News MoneyWatch, “The money is on Hillary Clinton to bury Donald Trump,” March 28, 2016, http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-money-is-on-hillary-clinton-to-bury-donald-trump/)

Prediction one: Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton will win their parties' nominations. Prediction two: Clinton will take the White House handily. At least, that's what political wagering websites say.¶ These operations, which distill the wisdom of crowds, turn out to be surprisingly solid when it comes to predicting presidential races. Their record for accuracy outdoes that of opinion polls.¶ Most Web-based political investment markets -- they don't like to call themselves betting pools, not wanting to run up against online gambling bans -- are structured to run much like commodity futures exchanges.¶ According to the oldest such election bourse, the Iowa Electronic Markets, which has been operating since 1988, Trump has 85 percent odds of capturing the Republican nomination this year; Clinton has a 90 percent chance of gaining the Democratic prize. And the Democrats' candidate in the fall is the favorite, by 67-33 percent. (The Iowa market, run by the University of Iowa, doesn't put a person's name at the head of the ticket before the party's nominating convention.)¶ That's a slightly better result for Clinton than the Bloomberg poll finds: 54 percent for her and 36 percent for Trump.¶ Another prominent exchange that trafficks in the presidential contest is Predictit, a two-year-old organization run by Victoria University in New Zealand, with a Washington, D.C., office. Both the Iowa exchange and Predictit received OKs from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to operate. The two organizations view themselves as more of an academic experiment than a business. Then there are the storied British betting houses, Ladbrokes and Betfair Group. The two U.K. firms accept actual bets, chiefly on sports and casino games, but also have lively gambling action on how elections will fare. By law, however, U.S. dwellers can't deal with these outfits, which have similar American election prognostication numbers as the Iowa exchange and Predictit.¶ How accurate are these predictions?For nationwide races, as opposed to state presidential primaries and caucuses, they have been quite reliable, and more so closer to an election.¶ Iowa professors did a study of their exchange's results through 2008, its 20-year anniversary. They found it was accurate 74 percent of the time 100 days from an election, defining "accuracy" as being more precise than the polls. Opinion polls tend to be more exact right before a balloting, as voters focus with greater intensity on the candidates. So, five days prior to an election, the exchange was better than the polls 68 percent of the time. Predictit says it has an 84 percent accuracy rate, as measured against actual voting outcomes.¶ The task is tougher for primaries and caucuses. Predictit nailed the most recent contests, in Arizona, Utah and Idaho. But for Super Tuesday on March 1, it mistakenly projected that Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders would lose to Clinton in Minnesota and Oklahoma. Instead, he won those two states by convincing margins.¶ The reason likely is that when traders from around the nation predict a specific state's outcome, they're not always clued into its particular situation. Brandi Travis, a spokeswoman for Predictit, said its Iowa-resident traders were more accurate for that's state's Feb. 1 caucus results than were non-Iowa ones.¶ For the next big contest, April 5 in Wisconsin, Predictit says Texas Sen. Ted Cruz will sweep to victory with 60 percent of the vote, versus 40 percent for Trump. For the Democrats, the exchange's traders believe, Sanders will outpace Clinton, 54-48 percent.¶ Why are they often so prescient?Various studies conclude that it's the nature of the people who participate in the electoral exchanges: mainly those who are highly informed about politics. Plus, they have a monetary stake in their election picks, which makes them take the endeavor more seriously than someone selected at random by pollsters for a phone survey.¶ "Polls are a static, one-time prediction," said Joyce Berg, a University of Iowa accounting professor who's the exchange's director. But traders on the exchange, she added, are continuously drinking in new information about the political state of play, and thus are more in tune with changing dynamics.

## Links

### Empirics Go Neg

#### Gun owners will block pro-gun control candidates from winning – overwhelming empirics prove

Frizell 15

Sam Frizell @Sam\_Frizell Nov. 6, 2015 Why Hillary Clinton Thinks Gun Control Can Win in 2016 http://time.com/4101947/hillary-clinton-guns-democrats/

Still, there’s a reason that Democrats shied away from arguments about guns in the past. Already, **opponents of gun control are gearing up to do battle against Clinton** on the general election. **For decades, the NRA has won key elections by motivating gun owners to show up at the polls. After the Brady Bill was passed** by President Bill Clinton banning assault weapons and requiring federal background checks, the **Democrats lost the House** of Representatives in 1994. In 2000, Bill **Clinton blamed Al Gore’s general election loss on the NRA and gun lobbies**, saying they “probably had more to do than anyone else in the fact we didn’t win the House this time, and they hurt Al Gore.” **Gun owners remain a highly motivated voting bloc. Some 40% of Americans who want looser gun laws will only vote for a candidate that agrees with them**, versus just around 21% of Americans who want stricter gun laws, according to a Gallup poll from last month. And this week, **the NRA is claiming victory in a series of highly publicized state races in Virginia that saw gun rights candidates win**. In one race in the Richmond area, **pro-gun control Democrat Daniel Gecker lost a key race for state Senate despite $700,000 invested by a Bloomberg group**, and an additional $700,000 on advertising by Americans for Responsible Solutions—unusually large sums for a local election. “On Tuesday night, **Virginia voters undercut recent assertions by gun control advocates that the political calculus has changed**,” said Jennifer Baker, director of public affairs at the NRA Institute for Legislative Action. “The rebuke of Bloomberg’s anti-gun campaign in a state like Virginia does not bode well for Hillary Clinton and other politicians that are running on an anti-Second Amendment platform.” **According to data collected by the National Rifle Association, at least 12.8 million people have concealed carry permits, and the total number of Americans who carry a gun with them is likely much higher. It is a dramatic increase from previous elections, and it reflects an ever-larger and more-committed slice of the electorate that view guns as a top issue**. Organizers say **these voters** have a strong attachment to guns and **will overwhelmingly oppose Clinton at the polls**. “She thinks **she is** just **insulting people in upstate New York and Montana** but **she doesn’t understand it’s a personal thing**,” said conservative organizer Grover Norquist. “If you’re a guy who carries a gun around with him it’s a part of you. And she doesn’t know that.” Regardless, Clinton has shown no signs of slowing her charge. **If some committed gun toters of 2008 no longer support Clinton, that’s because she is no longer talking to them**.

### AT Gun Control Lobby

#### Gun rights groups far outspend gun control groups

Gurciullo 15

With a gun lobby lock on Congress, Clinton would try executive action, by Brianna Gurciullo on October 5, 2015

**The lobbying outlays of gun rights organizations dipped** a bit in 2014, **to $12 million**, as the threat of tighter regulation receded. Still, that was far more than those interests had spent any other year except the previous one. The sum included $3.36 million shelled out by the National Rifle Association, down slightly from its 2013 total of $3.4 million but more than its fellow Second Amendment enthusiasts such as the National Association for Gun Rights ($3.08 million), the National Shooting Sports Foundation ($3.07 million) and Gun Owners of America ($1.45 million). **On the other side, gun control groups spent a sliver of that, $1.9 million**, with most of the money coming from Everytown for Gun Safety. **Much of the legislation pending in Congress now could ease the public’s ability to buy or carry firearms**. One of the NRA’s lobbying lobbying priorities this year has been the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act, which would allow a person who carries government-issued identification and has a concealed gun permit in one state to carry a concealed handgun in another state, as long as the person adheres to the other state’s restrictions. There’s a similar measure pending in the Senate. Through mid-year, gun rights groups have spent about $5.7 million making their case in D.C. Their opponents have spent less than one-sixth that amount: $868,000. The partisan divide is clearly drawn in the gun debate. During the 2014 midterm cycle, **gun rights groups donated nearly $3.4 million to federal candidates and political parties – 97 percent of which went to Republicans. The biggest donor by quite a bit was the NRA**. In comparison, gun control organizations gave out very little directly, instead spending their money on independent expenditures, like the $387,000 laid out by Everytown. But the NRA left the gun control groups in the dust in the outside spending category as well, reaching deep for $28 million during the 2014 cycle. It spent $11 million urging voters to support Republican candidates and $15 million calling for the defeat of Democrats. The organization levied more than $2 million each against Michelle Nunn (D-Ga.) and Sens. Kay Hagan (D-N.C.), Mary Landrieu (D-La.) and Mark Udall (D-Colo.), as well as Rep. Bruce Braley (D-Iowa) – all of whom lost their Senate election or re-election bids. It spent close to $2 million each in support of now-Sens. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.), who defeated Hagan, and Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), who also defeated a Democratic incumbent. **Gun rights groups and their employees have given more than $35 million since 1990 to federal candidates and parties, with 87 percent of recipients being Republicans**. About $21 million of that money has come from the NRA. **Meanwhile, the gun control industry has donated about $2 million to that same universe of recipients since 1990**. Ninety-four percent of them have been Democrats.

### Hillary is Pro-Gun Control, not Bernie

#### Hillary alone is pro-gun control, Sanders isn’t

Ollstein 16

ALICE OLLSTEIN JAN 13, 2016 8:00 AM, Endorsements Pour In For Hillary Clinton From Gun Control Advocates Think Progress.org, http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2016/01/13/3738411/hillary-gun-control-votes/

Clai Lasher-Sommers, who survived being shot by her stepfather in 1970, was still conflicted in September about who to support for president. She told ThinkProgress that she believed in “everything” Sen. Bernie **Sanders** (I-VT) stood for, but couldn’t bring herself to vote for him because of his **checkered record on gun control**. Those same concerns have since **prompted** Lasher-Sommers and other gun violence **survivors and advocacy groups to throw their support behind Hillary** Clinton, which could prove crucial to her campaign with the first presidential caucuses and primaries only weeks away. “I have met her and talked to her twice,” Lasher-Sommers said. “I’m a cynic by nature, but I found that she’s authentic and she cares. **She’s reached out to [gun violence] survivors in different states, and she didn’t have to** do that, especially in New Hampshire, which practically has more guns than people.” The Granite State doesn’t quite have more guns than people, but the rate of gun ownership is high and getting higher. Already boasting the 13th highest number of registered guns per capita, the number of registered guns jumped 20 percent in New Hampshire between 2014 and 2015. “More than 33,000 people are dying every year [from gun violence],” Lasher-Sommers said. “**Whoever gets into the White House needs to address this forcefully and know how to negotiate well.** I watched her as Secretary of State, as the First Lady, and as New York’s Senator, and I think this is something **she’s going to follow through** with. **She is consistent on this issue, and Bernie Sanders is not**.” **Clinton is enjoying a wave of support and endorsements that specifically cite differences between her and rival Bernie Sanders on the issue of gun control.** On a frigid Tuesday morning in Iowa, **the head of one of the country’s leading gun control groups** echoed Lasher-Sommers’ **praise[d]** for the former Secretary of State. Calling **Clinton** “a true national leader and advocate for the safer nation we all want and deserve,” the president of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence Dan **Gross told voters** gathered in Ames that **Clinton is the only candidate in the 2016 truly committed to gun safety**. “Doing what I do, I’ve had the chance to meet a lot of politicians and elected officials, including a number of those currently running for president,” said Gross, whose own brother was severely wounded in a 1997 mass shooting. “And I can say with certainty that when it comes to real national leadership on this issue there is so clearly one candidate that rises above all the others — and that candidate is Hillary.” **Gross criticized** Clinton’s main rival, Sen. Bernie **Sanders** (I-VT), **for voting against the Brady gun control bill, as well as his votes in favor of** the **Protection of** Lawful Commerce in **Arms Act** — which Gross called “literally one of the most evil pieces of special interest backed legislation to pass in decades.” **That law, which the National Rifle Association backed, gives gun manufacturers legal immunity when their weapons are used in violent crimes**. It passed in 2005 with Sanders voting in favor. “A small group of craven politicians, including most of the other **Presidential candidates, [are] putting the interests of the gun lobby ahead** of the safety of the American people,” Gross said Tuesday. “Enough! The American people have had enough and so has Hillary Clinton — and **I have absolutely no doubt that as President she will continue to take on the corporate gun lobby**.” A small group of craven politicians, including most of the other Presidential candidates, [are] putting the interests of the gun lobby ahead of the safety of the American people. On Sunday, former Congress member and gun violence survivor Gabby Giffords also endorsed Clinton, citing her votes in the U.S. Senate against legal impunity for gun manufacturers and for federal background checks. “**Only one candidate for president has the determination and toughness to stand up to the corporate gun lobby — and the record to prove it**,” she wrote, speaking for herself and her husband, retired astronaut Mark Kelly. Giffords, who now runs the pro-gun control group Americans for Responsible Solutions, also praised Clinton’s promises to expand background checks and crack down on the illegal gun trade if elected president. Then, on Monday, Sybrina Fulton, whose unarmed 17-year-old son Trayvon Martin was gunned down in 2012, published her own endorsement for Clinton. “I know Clinton is tough enough to wage this fight. I’ve seen her do it for years,” she wrote. “As first lady, she advocated for the Brady Bill and convened meetings on school violence. As a senator, she voted to extend the assault weapons ban and against an immunity law that protects irresponsible gun makers and dealers from liability. In spending some time with her in person, I also found a mother and a grandmother who truly heard me, and understood the depth of my loss.” As the national conversation on gun violence has intensified over a year marked by mass shootings and political inaction, **Sanders has had to defend his past votes and characterize himself as a builder of bridges** between the pro- and anti-gun factions of the U.S. “I come from a state that has virtually no gun control. But we in Vermont know that guns mean something very different in cities and states all over this country than they mean in Vermont,” he told ThinkProgress in September. “Coming from a state where guns are mostly used for hunting, I’m someone who can bring people together for commonsense gun control legislation. You know, there are some who want no gun control at all, and some who want to take away every gun in America. We can scream and yell at each other, but I don’t think that’s going to solve the problem.” If you’re going to go around saying you stand up to special interests, why don’t you stand up to the big special interest of the gun lobby? In a letter to supporters in December, Sanders vowed if elected to renew the assault weapons ban and end the sale of high capacity magazines, ban those on the FBI’s terrorist watch list from purchasing firearms, and authorize the government to research the causes of gun violence. Clinton’s policy platform calls for universal background checks, including on sales at gun shows and online, as well as the repeal of the gun manufacturers immunity law. Both candidates want new legislation to prevent domestic abusers and stalkers from buying guns. As Sanders edges ahead of Clinton in the polls in Iowa and increases his margin in New Hampshire, **the former first lady has been sharpening her attacks against him, especially on his gun control record**. In Ames on Tuesday, Clinton went after him again. “He always says, ‘Well I’m from Vermont.’ But Pat Leahy, the other Senator from Vermont, didn’t vote for immunity for gun manufacturers. So that’s not really an explanation,” she said. “Bernie and I have big differences over guns, and I think it’s important. If you’re going to go around saying you stand up to special interests, why don’t you stand up to the big special interest of the gun lobby? Instead, **he voted for what the NRA called their biggest priority**.”

## AT Thumpers

### AT Thumpers General

#### No thumpers until after the election.

Ota 4/6. (Amanda Ota is a political correspondent for WHAM News in Rochester, New York. Congress usually comes up lame in 'lame duck' POTUS years. April 7, 2016. <http://13wham.com/features/community-connection/congress-usually-comes-up-lame-in-lame-duck-potus-years>. MMG)

WASHINGTON (SINCLAIR BROADCAST GROUP) — The White House is currently in the midst of a number of political battles with Congress, as the Obama administration struggles to get the legislative body to take action during the election season. Congressional reluctance to take action has been common so far this year, with lawmakers refusing to make moves in the shadow of the election. Government Track, a website that keeps track of the actions of Congress,tallies up the number of laws enacted, resolutions passed and votes held since the 93rd Congress of 1973 and 1974. Based on their count, the least a Congress voted on legislation historically was 390 times, which occurred during the 112th Congress. Since then, the two following Congresses to serve under President Obama's tenure have managed to narrowly escaped similarly dismal vote records. "Our calculation finds that the 113th just barely avoided the dubious title of "least productive Congress in modern history," The Pew Research Center's Drew Desilver wrote back in 2014. "In all, the expiring Congress enacted 296 laws, 13 more than the 2011-12 Congress." So far, the current Congress has not shown a lot of promise, having thus far only voted on 4 percent of legislation before them. As David Mayhew, political scientist and Sterling Professor in the Political Science Department at Yale University described it, it is still too early to rate the ongoing session. "I don't see anything to chalk up yet," Mayhew said describing calendar year 2016 as "stuttering." "But it's early," he cautioned adding that the "best bet may be a fix of the Puerto Rico fiscal crisis." "They seem to be blocking on a criminal sentencing reform. The Pacific trade deal is low in the water." Saying how he was unable to tell, Mayhew explained that "in recent election years, a fair amount of enacting has happened during a November-December [lameduck] session after the election. " Analyzing legislation that had been passed during the lame duck session of the 113th Congress, DeSilver wrote that "we classified 71 of the 111 laws passed during the lame duck session as substantive, or 64% the lowest such percentage among the past eight Congresses." The fact that Congress isn't making any game-changing legislative moves is unsurprising, according to experts. Speaking with Sinclair earlier in the election, Georgetown's Dr. Joshua Huder, Senior Fellow at Georgetown University's Government Affairs Institute, explained this Congress was bound to be unproductive. "If you started off really well you'd still have a really bad year, this is doomed to be a low turnout, low productivity congress," Huder said Huder said to expect much more political messaging than actual legislation. For example he described the 112th and 113th congress as, "obsmially [un]productive" and "terrible." "There will be votes, not legislation," Dr. Matthew Lebo, and Associate Professor of Political Science at Stony Brook University, told Sinclair back in January.

### AT Garland

#### Republicans will hold off on confirmation hearings until after the election, and even if hold it sooner, it won’t affect votes.

Mataconis 4/26. (Doug Mataconis is a lawyer and founder of the political website Outside the Beltway. Voters Don’t Seem To Care About The Political Fight Over Vacant Supreme Court Seat. April 26, 2016. <http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/voters-dont-seem-to-care-about-the-political-fight-over-vacant-supreme-court-seat/>. MMG)

It’s been more than two months since Justice Antonin Scalia died while on vacation in Texas, and a month since President Obama appointed Judge Merrick Garland as his choice to replace Scalia on the nation’s highest Court. In the time since his name was put up for nomination, Garland has met with many members of the Senate, including several Republican Senators who have vowed that there would be neither hearings nor a vote on a replacement to fill the vacancy left by Justice Scalia’s death. So far at least, there has been no action at all on Garland’s nomination and no indication there will be any any action before President Obama leaves office in nine months. Over this same period of time, there has been polling which indicates that most Americans would prefer if the Senate did hold hearings and a vote on the nomination, but there hasn’t been any indication of just how important this nomination is to voters and what impact it might have on the November elections, specifically on Senate elections that will decide who ends up controlling the upper chamber starting in January 2017. If this tidbit from Associated Press reporter Julia Pace from Sunday’s edition of Inside Politics on CNN is any indication, the Garland nomination, and the “No Hearings, No Votes” position the GOP appear to be something that few people outside the beltway actually care about: PACE: I sat in on some focus groups this past week with both swing voters and Republican voters, and some of the questions they were asked were about the Supreme Court nomination of Merrick Garland. And this was a real reality check for anyone in Washington who thinks that this issue is really animating voters across the country. I was so struck by how these voters seemed comply uninterested in the nomination fight. Among the swing voters, not one of them said that this was something that would really impact their vote in the fall. And even among the Republican voters who felt like this nomination should wait until the next president, almost none felt like this was an issue that was going to affect their vote either in the presidential race or in their Senate race. KING: Nice try Mr. President, I guess is the result. Pace’s experience with these focus groups is anecdotal, of course, and may not necessarily be representative of the electorate as a whole, but it is consistent with voter behavior in past elections, and it suggests that neither the nomination nor the Senate’s refusal to act on it are going to have much of an impact on the election. It slso suggests that Senate Republicans are unlikely to be motivated to change their position on the nomination at any point before the General Election in November. Historically, the Supreme Court has never been a top voter concern in elections in the past, and generally not among those that voters have told pollsters would play a huge role in their decision on who to vote or in the General Election. Instead, as has almost always been the case, it’s the economy and so-called “pocketbook” issues that voters identify as being important to them. To the extent there are people who feel strongly enough about issues like this for it to impact their vote, they generally tend to fall into two categories. The people in the first group are hard-core Democrats who aren’t going to support Republican candidates for the Senate in any case, so their opinions are ones that GOP Senators tend to ignore. The second group consists of hard core Republicans who strongly support the “No Hearings, No Votes” position and strongly oppose anyone being confirmed to replace Justice Scalia before the next President takes office. This group has made clear that there would be consequences for Senators deviating from the ‘No Hearings, No Votes” position, including possible primary challenges from more conservative candidates and the threat that conservative voter could stay home in November. This is the electoral calculus that Senate Republicans are faced with, and it makes the reasons why they will likely stick together on the decision to take no action on the nomination at least until after the election entirely understandable. The fact that voters as a whole don’t particularly seem to care about these political machinations, it’s likely that they won’t pay much of a political price for their stubbornness.

### AT Puerto Rican Debt

#### Puerto Rican relief won’t pass before the Monday deadline and the next one is in July—not bipartisan at all.

NY Times 4/29. (Puerto Rico Debt Deadline Looms With Washington Still Haggling. April 29, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/30/business/dealbook/washington-still-haggling-as-puerto-rico-debt-deadline-looms.html>. MMG)

In December, House Speaker Paul D. Ryan instructed lawmakers to find a “responsible solution” to Puerto Rico’s debt crisis in the first three months of this year, giving the island plenty of time to prepare for a May 1 deadline on a $422 million debt payment. So much for that. That deadline is imminent, but Republicans in the House and Democrats in the administration are still haggling over the terms of a bill to rescue Puerto Rico. Missing the payment risks further destabilizing its shrunken economy. And there are concerns that the passage of any legislation could be delayed until the island nears the tipping point of its debt woes: a $2 billion debt payment due on July 1. The May 1 payment consists mainly of principal and interest due from Puerto Rico’s Government Development Bank, a uniquely powerful institution that has played a leading role in the island’s borrowing and financial affairs for decades. Its activities are so numerous and critical that analysts have worried for months that the bank’s failure would have untold ripple effects across the island. Puerto Rico’s governor, Alejandro García Padilla, who has warned about defaults for months, has expressed frustration with Washington’s inability to act quickly. “On Monday there will be a default,” he said on Wednesday. The bank has until the close of business on Monday, since the May 1 due date falls on a Sunday. But the bigger issue may be that second, larger debt bill due in July, roughly $800 million of which is constitutionally guaranteed, giving the payment of it legal priority even over the funding of essential public services, such as police patrols, ambulances or drinking water. Investors who hold the guaranteed debt say they are prepared to fight to enforce their legal rights, no matter how much it may shock and anger the island’s residents. “There’s too much discord,” said Matt Fabian, a managing director at Municipal Market Analytics, referring to the rancor over the rescue bill. “This was supposed to be a very controlled process, and it just got out of hand.” When Mr. Ryan ordered debt relief for Puerto Rico, he may not have known just how intractable the differences were going to be — not only between Democrats and Republicans, but also among certain classes of creditors, some of whom are intent on avoiding the sort of losses that Detroit bondholders were forced to bear after that city went bankrupt in 2013. In addition to lobbying Congress, some of the bondholders are sponsoring television ads that depict the rescue of Puerto Rico as an odious taxpayer bailout. And some other creditors are in quiet talks with representatives of the Puerto Rican government, testing the waters for a sweeping negotiated debt reduction that might obviate congressional action.

#### Won’t pass—no legislation out yet and a bail-out isn’t even on the table.

FOX Latino 4/26. (U.S. Congress won't act on Puerto Rico's debt before deadline, House leader says. April 26, 2016. <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/money/2016/04/26/us-congress-wont-act-on-puerto-rico-debt-before-deadline-house-leader-says/>. MMG)

Congress will not act to help debt-ridden Puerto Rico ahead of a May 1 deadline when nearly half-a-billion dollars in bond payments come due, House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy said Tuesday. The California Republican's admission to reporters amounted to a statement of the obvious, given that the deadline is days away and the House has failed so far even to get a bill out of committee. A more important deadline looms July 1 when around $2 billion in principle and interest payments come due. McCarthy said he's "hopeful" a bipartisan bill could emerge from the House by then, though the Senate still would have to act. Even as the island territory, home to 3.5 million American citizens, faces financial catastrophe, Congress has been unable to come together around a solution. Some House conservatives have been scared off by an aggressive ad campaign, funded by shadowy interests, claiming congressional intervention would amount to a bailout. In fact, McCarthy and House Speaker Paul Ryan have been adamant there will be no bailout. Instead the bill they back would set up a control board that could help the commonwealth restructure its ballooning debt, much of it resulting from decades of Washington tax policies that encouraged investment in Puerto Rico, then drove it away. "We're going to protect taxpayers, it will not be a bailout," McCarthy said. "And if we don't proactively do that we could be in a situation that puts taxpayers at risk."

#### Won’t pass and won’t solve—too many ideological battles. XO is more likely and the plan doesn’t link.

NBC News 4/29. (As Clock Ticks on Debt Payment, Puerto Rico Braces for What's Next. April 29, 2016. <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/clock-ticks-debt-payment-puerto-rico-braces-what-s-next-n564891>. MMG)

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. House of Representatives goes on a week-long recess on Saturday without moving on legislation to help Puerto Rico restructure its debt, virtually guaranteeing there will be no congressional action before a $422 million debt payment on May 2nd that the island government says it cannot pay. "On Monday there's going to be a non-payment. I don't think that we'll find $422 million in the next few days that we haven't found before," Puerto Rico Governor Alejandro García Padilla said earlier this week in San Juan. "Although we're working with the creditors to come up with an agreement that would help us, I don't think there's anything on the table that would stop that non-payment. At this point, the ball is in Congress' court." Puerto Rico is going through a severe economic crisis; there have been drastic cuts in health, education and public services as the government has run out of cash. There are regular reports of school closings, hospital wings are being shut down and the island has seen its residents leave for the U.S. mainland in the biggest migration since World War II. Despite steep unemployment, the island's sales tax is the highest in the U.S. at 11.5 percent. There are looming questions of how the island will be able to pay teachers' pensions and how it will handle running essential services. Home foreclosures are the highest in the entire country. Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory and its residents are U.S. citizens. The island commonwealth's government says it plans to use a new law it recently passed that allows for a moratorium on debt payments if no agreement is reached to defer those debt payments. That law sets a "moratorium period" that would run through the end of January 2017. The debt would come due at the end of the moratorium, but island officials say this will give them some breathing room to renegotiate and seek help from Washington, and some payments would be made on a "case by case" basis during the suspension of payments to creditors. This is not the first time that Puerto Rico has made an attempt to restructure its debt, arguing they should be allowed to restructure under Chapter 9 as allowed in the 50 states but not in the island since 1984. "We are not asking for anything unreasonable, because we already had this before," said island senator Ramon Luis Nieves. The government had passed a law last year in Puerto Rico allowing them to restructure but it was struck down by a federal court; it is currently under review in the U.S. Supreme Court. Island officials insist the situation is critical and requires drastic steps. "This is a crisis situation. We've been working on this for a year, and there is a solution, but there has to be a will. We will definitely default on the payment on Monday, but what we are doing is postponing the payment. We aren't saying we're not going to pay it," said Puerto Rico Senate President Eduardo Bhatia. "We are not asking for a bailout. What we are asking for is a restructuring. We have always made our payments. We have no intention of not ever paying."A bill to help the island deal with its $72 billion debt has stalled in Congress over several disagreements, including a proposed federal oversight control board not accountable to the island government, and changes to the federal minimum wage for younger workers on the island. "A bad bill is not any better than no bill at all. Puerto Rico shouldn't be asked to give up its democracy. The members of Congress are not asking that of their own constituents and they shouldn't ask it of Puerto Rico," says Federico de Jesús, a former Puerto Rico government aide and principal at FDJ Solutions, a government policy consulting group. "There still is division among the legislators. They're listening to a small group of bond holders. It's disheartening and a real shame." If Congress doesn't do anything, then the White House should, adds de Jesús. "President Obama should enact emergency measures to help the island, much in the same way he did for the immigration community with his executive action on immigration reform." Carlos Mercader, deputy director of the conservative advocacy group Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, agrees, saying no one should wait for congressional action. "Things in Congress aren't moving, they're getting stuck in ideological battles. The island should negotiate directly with creditors and negotiate directly with the executive branch, and with (the) Treasury (department)," Mercader said, adding, "Look at all the attention and action on Cuba. Why can't he (President Obama) do the same thing for Puerto Rico?" The congressional legislation has also been criticized for including measures that seem unrelated to debt relief. "A provision in the legislation permits the transfer of 3,100 acres of federal land to Puerto Rico. I believe we need to incorporate protections to ensure that this land is not sold and used to make a 'quick buck' by private developers," said Rep. Nydia Velázquez (D-N.Y.), a native of Puerto Rico. But at a recent summit on the Puerto Rico issue in New York City, Treasury official Antonio Weiss urged a swift passage of Congressional legislation to at least set Puerto Rico on a path to some form of restructuring without the threat of lawsuits from investors. The Center for Individual Freedom, a conservative group based in Alexandra, Va., has been running television ads opposing the congressional bill, calling it a "bailout on the backs of savers and seniors." Federal and island officials and legislators who support a bill in Congress to aid Puerto Rico say the ads are misleading because there is no federal money involved in working on a debt relief agreement, so it can't be considered a "bailout."

## Internal Link

### 1NR – Obama Key to Hillary

#### Lazaroff says Obama is key to a Hillary victory. Cites statistics from the last nine elections and in all but one the sitting president’s party won the election of the president had an approval rating of near 50%. Obama is holding at 46% which makes a Hillary victory likely but a plummet below 40 almost guarantees a loss.

#### Hillary is winning, but it’s contingent on Obama’s popularity

Adams 15 (Myra, “Five Reasons Why Hillary Wins in 2016,” National Review, April 13, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/416867/five-reasons-why-hillary-wins-2016-myra-adams>)

Therefore, any Republican pundit or pollster who downplays the true meaning and potential of Hillary’s historic candidacy is being untruthful, or has his head in the sand. The Electoral College Is the GOP’s Worst Enemy Our constitutionally mandated Electoral College has evolved to a point where it is slanted in favor of the Democratic party’s nominee. If Hillary is indeed the 2016 Democratic nominee, all she has to do to win the necessary 270 electoral votes is sustain the historic equation outlined in my November National Review piece “Breaking the Blue Barrier.” That equation is: 1992 + 1988 + Florida = a Democrat in the White House. That first number represents the ten states with a total of 152 electoral votes that have been won by every Democratic presidential nominee since 1992. The second number represents the nine states with a total of 90 electoral votes that have been won by every Democratic presidential nominee since 1988. Together, those states command 242 electoral votes. Thus, if Hillary follows the Electoral College precedent that has held since 1992 and also wins Florida, with its 29 electoral votes (or any combination of states yielding 28 votes), Bill Clinton would be elected First Dude. (Mothers, hide your daughters!) Florida, need I remind you, was won by Obama, though by small margins, in both 2008 and 2012, ensuring that in 2016 Mrs. Clinton will become a de facto resident of the Sunshine State. Obama’s Third Term There has been much talk about Hillary either winning or losing Obama’s “third term.” My theory is that she will find a way to take only what she needs and jettison the rest. And what she needs is Obama’s winning voter coalition of women, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, voters aged 18 to 44, voters with incomes under $50,000, and those belonging to a union. It is no coincidence that Hillary’s high command is stacked with seasoned veterans from Obama’s two campaigns who are adept at delivering these voter groups. Additionally, the CEO of Hillary 2016 is John Podesta, who was President Bill Clinton’s chief of staff, and who was “counselor to the president” in Obama’s White House until he stepped down in February. Podesta, known as one of Washington’s fiercest political operators, was also the mastermind behind Obama’s excessive use of executive orders. Now, Republicans, get ready for some astounding news: President Obama’s current job approval rating stands at 45.3 percent, with a 50.3 percent disapproval rating, according to Real Clear Politics. These are highly respectable approval numbers for a seventh presidential year, which explains the following paragraph from yesterday’s New York Times: “Mrs. Clinton and her team have decided that, on balance, the risk of lining up near Mr. Obama’s record is worth taking. Rather than run from Mr. Obama, she intends to turn to him as one of her campaign’s most important allies and advocates — second only, perhaps, to her husband, the other president whose record will hover over her bid.”

#### Even FOX News agrees.

FOX News 1/18. (Clinton embraces Obama in final stretch, fueling GOP claims of seeking '3rd term.’ January 18, 2016. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/01/18/clinton-embraces-obama-in-final-stretch-fueling-gop-claims-seeking-3rd-term.html?intcmp=hpbt2>. MMG)

If you like Barack Obama, you’ll love Hillary Clinton. That seems to be the Democratic front-runner’s pitch as she charges into the final stretch to the Iowa caucuses, embracing the administration’s agenda and casting rival Bernie Sanders as a threat to that legacy – a strategy on full display at Sunday’s primary debate. On stage in Charleston, S.C., Clinton accused the Vermont senator of wanting to “tear” up ObamaCare, which she called “one of the greatest accomplishments of President Obama, of the Democratic Party and of our country.” She accused him of trying to run a primary challenger against Obama in 2011. And she publicly defended the president on controversial calls, including the decision to back off the “red line” with Syria’s Bashar Assad. Sanders, for his part, pushed back on Clinton’s allegations – saying he’s not trying to scrap the health care law and reminding voters he ended up supporting Obama in 2012 despite their differences. But the exchanges helped underscore an emerging dynamic in the race. Clinton is deliberately running toward Obama – not away from him – as she nears the early-voting contests, surely hoping to capture the voters who helped propel him to victory in 2008, particularly in South Carolina and other states she may need as a firewall. “She’s appealing to her base and for better or worse, she’s with Obama as much as she can be in this election,” Adam Goodman, Republican strategist and principal of The Victory Group, told FoxNews.com.

#### Unpopular move by Obama would kill Hillary’s campaign – we’re at the tipping point

Judis, 2014 (John B., “History Shows That Hillary Clinton Is Unlikely to Win in 2016,” New Republic, November 17, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/120303/democrats-hillary-clinton-could-lose-2016-presidential-election>)

The chief obstacle that any Democratic nominee will face is public resistance to installing a president from the same party in the White House for three terms in a row. If you look at the presidents since World War II, when the same party occupied the White House for two terms in a row, that party’s candidate lost in the next election six out of seven times. The one exception was George H.W. Bush's 1988 victory after two terms of Ronald Reagan, but Bush, who was seventeen points behind Democratic nominee Michael Dukakis at the Republican convention, was only able to win because his campaign manager Lee Atwater ran a brilliant campaign against an extraordinarily weak opponent. (Democrats might also insist that Al Gore really won in 2000, but even if he had, he would have done so very narrowly with unemployment at 4.0 percent.) There are three reasons why the three-term obstacle has prevailed. The first and most obvious has been because the incumbent has become unpopular during his second term, and his unpopularity has carried over to the nominee. That was certainly the case with Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson in 1952, Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey in 1968, Gerald Ford (who had succeeded Richard Nixon) in 1976, and George W. Bush and John McCain in 2008. The second reason has to do with an accumulation over eight years of small or medium-sized grievances that, while not affecting the incumbent’s overall popularity, still weighed down the candidate who hoped to succeed him. Dwight Eisenhower remained highly popular in 1960, but some voters worried about repeated recessions during his presidency, or about his support for school integration; Bill Clinton remained popular, and unemployment low, in 2000, but his second term had been marred by the Monica Lewinsky scandal, and coal-state voters worried about Democrats’ support for Kyoto while white Southern voters worried about the administration’s support for African American causes. The third reason has to do with the voters’ blaming party gridlock between the president and congress partly on the president and his party. That was a factor in 1960—James McGregor Burns was inspired to write The Deadlock of Democracy by the Eisenhower years—and it was also a factor in the 2000 elections. In the 2016 election, not just one, but all three of these factors will be in play and will jeopardize the Democratic nominee. Obama and his administration are likely to remain unpopular among voters. There is already an accretion of grievances among Obama and the Democrats that will carry over to the nominee. These include the Affordable Care Act, which, whatever benefits it has brought to many Americans, has alienated many senior citizens (who see the bill as undermining Medicare), small business owners and employees, and union leaders and workers whose benefits will now be taxed. Add to these the grievances around the administration’s stands on coal, immigration, guns, and civil rights, including most recently its support for the protestors in Ferguson. There are, of course, many voters who would vote for a Republican regardless of who had been in office, but there are many voters in the middle (especially in presidential years) whose vote, or failure to vote at all, will be swayed by a particular grievance. That certainly hurt Al Gore in 2000, McCain in 2008, and could hurt the Democratic nominee in 2016. It’s a very rough measure, but you can look at the shift in the independent vote in 1960, 1968, 1976, 2000, and 2008 to see how the accretion of grievances can sway voters in the middle. There are, of course, mitigating factors that could help a Democrat to succeed in 2016. Demography and turnout are important, although not decisive. (A Democrat still has to win over 40 percent of the white vote to succeed, as well as nearly 70 percent of the Hispanic vote.) The quality of the candidate is also important. If the opposition party nominates candidates who are ineffective, as Dukakis was, or are incapable of moving to the center (either temperamentally or because of party pressures), then the candidate of the party in the White House can win. Equally, if the party in the White House nominates someone who is greatly admired (as Herbert Hoover was in 1928), or runs a terrific campaign (as Bush-Atwater did in 1988), they can win. Can the Democrats overcome the third-term hitch in 2016? If the nominee is Hillary Clinton, as now appears likely, she should be able to command significant support among women and minorities—two key Democratic constituencies. Her experience gives her credibility as a candidate (the dynastic factor is primarily of interest to the press). And she is not positioned too far to the left. But in her 2008 run, neither she nor her campaign managers displayed the political skill of the last presidential victors. And she will have difficulty dissociating herself from the voters’ disapproval of Obama’s administration.

## Impact

### Trump Protectionism

#### Trump presidency causes protectionism

NZ Herald 2-13

Editorial: US elections take adverse turn for NZ 5:00 AM Saturday Feb 13, 2016

But the rivals share common ground in a key area of economic and trade policy which, if it comes to pass, could damage New Zealand's interests. Both [Bernie and Trump] men want to tear up free trade deals, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership which the US, along with 11 other nations around the region, signed in Auckland last week. New Zealand's prosperity rests on the ability to get exports into markets with as few impediments as possible. Sanders and Trump alike complain that trade deals signed by Washington over the years have come at the expense of American jobs. This has been an argument against trade liberalisation all along, but the political consensus that everyone benefits from free trade has prevailed. Now this policy is under fierce attack, with Trump and Sanders accusing the US political establishment of opening up American markets without extracting equal concessions from trade partners. Trump also proposes a steep tariff on Chinese imports - a move which would invite Beijing's retaliation. The implications for the global economy - and for New Zealand - could be profound. The White House race clearly bears watching.

Protectionism will cause global wars – risks extinction.

**Panzner 8** – faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase (Michael, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” p. 136-138)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to **full-scale military encounters,** often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles **soaked in blood**. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Militarism

#### GOP president causes aggressive foreign policy and interventionism

Eggert, 10/28/15 (Jessica, staff writer at the Mic, 2016 Presidential Election: Where Top Republican Candidates Stand on ISIS∂ http://mic.com/articles/127393/2016-presidential-election-where-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-isis)

The top Republican presidential candidates will [face off](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) on Wednesday during the third Republican primary debate, hosted by CNBC at the University of Colorado Boulder. The main event is slated to begin at 8 p.m. Eastern. ∂ The debate will focus on key economic issues like jobs, [taxes](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) and healthcare, but it is also expected to stray into other, more controversial topics like [immigration](http://mic.com/articles/127282/2015-cnbc-republican-debate-where-the-candidates-stand-on-immigration) and their strategies for combatting the terrorist group Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, also known as [ISIS](http://mic.com/articles/121757/these-horrifying-drawings-show-the-real-price-of-isis-terrorism-on-children).∂ Here's where the top Republican candidates stand on ISIS.∂ Business tycoon Donald Trump: Trump is confident in his ability to defeat ISIS through hostile military strategy. In August, Trump said he wants U.S. troops fighting ISIS on the ground in the Middle East — and that he's going to take their oil for the United States.∂ "I would knock out the source of their wealth, the primary sources of their wealth, which is oil," he said on MSNBC's [Morning Joe](http://on.msnbc.com/1P1ccbk). "And in order to do that, you would have to put boots on the ground. I would knock the hell out of them, but I'd put a ring around it and I'd take the oil for our country. I'd just take the oil."∂ On Monday's episode of NBC's Today, Trump said he approves of Russia bombing ISIS in Syria, as long as the U.S. does it too. "If Russia wants to go into Syria and bomb the hell out of ISIS, I'm sort of okay with that," Trump told Today, the [Huffington Post](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-russia-bomb-isis_562e15f0e4b0ec0a3894e3cf) reports. "But we have to do it too."∂ The problem with Trump's statement is that Russia is actually [bombing](http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/10/26/us-mideast-crisis-syria-idUSKCN0SK0QR20151026) Syrian rebels and civilians who oppose the regime of President Bashar al-Assad. Additionally, the U.S. and its allies have already been bombing ISIS for over a year. The U.S. spends $10 million each day launching aircrafts from the Middle East, according to Sunday's episode of [60 Minutes](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/inside-the-air-war-against-isis-60-minutes/), which disclosed that there are more than 160 aircrafts over Iraq and Syria every day. ∂ Huffington Post reports Trump also said onToday that he "would build our military so strong and so good ... that no one is going to mess with us."∂ Retired neurosurgeon Ben Carson: Carson has a [theme](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) of building his political theories on the Bible, and his stance on ISIS is no exception. In a March [interview](http://www.hughhewitt.com/dr-ben-carson-on-foreign-policy-and-national-defense-issues/) with conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt, Carson compared the story of radical Islam to the Biblical [story](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis%2025:19-34) of Jacob and Esau.∂ "Well, first of all you have to recognize they go back thousands and thousands of years, really back to the battle between Jacob and Esau," he said in the interview. "But it has been a land issue for a very long period of time."∂ In February, Carson told [Fox News](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ZiA7Ro3EFc) that the war against ISIS can't have rules, because "war" and "rules" contradict each other. ∂ "Our military needs to know that they're not going be prosecuted when they come back, because somebody has said, 'You did something that was politically incorrect,'" Carson told Fox News. "There is no such thing as a politically correct war. We need to grow up; we need to mature. If you're gonna have rules for war, you should just have a rule that says no war. Other than that, we have to win. Our life depends on it."∂ Texas Sen. Ted Cruz: Cruz has an [apocalyptic](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/09/how-to-defeat-isis-according-to-ted-cruz/380500/) view of the terrorist group. In a post written for [CNN](http://www.cnn.com/2014/09/10/opinion/ted-cruz-how-us-can-stop-isis/) in September, Cruz insisted that the U.S. must protect its border from a possible domestic ISIS attack. ∂ "First and foremost," he wrote in the blog post, "Washington should resolve to make border security a top priority finally, rather than an afterthought, of this plan in light of concerns about potential ISIS activities on our southern border," citing a Texas Department of Public Safety bulletin from a [Fox News](http://www.foxnews.com/us/2014/08/29/online-posts-show-isis-eyeing-mexican-border-says-law-enforcment-bulletin/) report. ∂ Cruz also asserted that any American who "supports" or "fights for" ISIS should have their citizenship revoked. "Congress should make fighting for or supporting ISIS an affirmative renunciation of American citizenship," he wrote in the CNN post. "Numerous Americans have joined ISIS along with hundreds of others from the European Union."∂ Finally, Cruz stressed that the U.S. must focus on military action to defeat ISIS. "Because of the very nature of ISIS," he wrote in the CNN post, "the response must be principally military," adding that "we should concentrate on a coordinated and overwhelming air campaign to destroy the capability of ISIS to carry out terrorist attacks on the United States."∂ Florida Sen. Marco Rubio: In February, at the Political Conservative Action Conference, Rubio said he would build a military coalition led by Sunni countries in the region to fight ISIS on the ground, supported by U.S. air power. ∂ "Put together a coalition of armed regional governments to confront [ISIS] on the ground with U.S. special forces support, logistical support, intelligence support and the most devastating air support possible," he said at the conference, the [Huffington Post](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/27/marco-rubio-cpac_n_6756806.html) reported, "and you will wipe ISIS out."∂ In the same speech, Rubio criticized President Barack Obama for his so-called lack of military policy against ISIS. "The reason Obama hasn't put in place a military strategy to defeat ISIS is because he doesn't want to upset Iran," he said, according to the Huffington Post.∂ MSNBC's Steve Benen pointed out two issues with Rubio's critique on the [MaddowBlog](http://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/rubio-blasts-isis-strategy-he-supports): ISIS and Iran are enemies, and Rubio's plan is quite similar to that of Obama. ∂ "Tehran is more than happy to see U.S. forces go after ISIS targets," Benen wrote in the post of Iran's stance on ISIS. "In fact, Iran has done the same thing. When it comes to the terrorist group, Americans and Iranians are on the same side. How could Rubio not know this?"∂ "The argument that Obama 'hasn't put in place a military strategy to defeat ISIS' is plainly untrue," Benen wrote on the MaddowBlog. "Rubio should know this, not only because he's a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and an unannounced presidential candidate, but also because Obama's strategy to defeat ISIS is largely identical to Marco Rubio's."∂ Florida Gov. Jeb Bush: In a foreign policy speech at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in August, Bush detailed a strategy against ISIS that involves a no-fly zone over Syria and U.S. troops on the ground in the Middle East, [CNN](http://www.cnn.com/2015/08/11/politics/jeb-bush-isis-speech/) reports, criticizing Obama and former Secretary of State and Democratic presidential front-runner Hillary Clinton for pulling U.S. troops out of Iraq. ∂ "So eager to be the history-makers, they failed to be the peacemakers," Bush said during the address, CNN reports. "Rushing away from danger can be every bit as unwise as rushing into danger, and the costs have been grievous."∂ He then affirmed his dedication to rebuilding military force against ISIS if elected. "I assure you: The day that I become president will be the day that we turn this around and begin rebuilding the armed forces of the United States," he said, CNN reports.∂ Bush also asserted that a no-fly zone over Syria is pertinent to fight ISIS and protect the Syrian people from President Bashar al-Assad's [regime](http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/isis-conflict-saudi-arabia-reaffirms-commitment-oust-syrian-president-bashar-al-assad-1525647).∂ Former Hewlett-Packard CEO Carly Fiorina: At an October campaign rally in New Hampshire, Fiorina said she'll apply her Stanford University bachelor's degree in medieval history and philosophy to defeat ISIS. ∂ "Finally my degree in medieval history and philosophy has come in handy," Fiorina said at the rally, [ABC](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/carly-fiorina-medieval-history-degree-helps-defeat-isis/story?id=34256597) reports, "because what ISIS wants to do is drive us back to the Middle Ages, literally." She rattled off several techniques ISIS uses that relate to that of the medieval times. "Every single one of the techniques that ISIS is using — the crucifixion, the beheadings, the burning alive — those were commonly used techniques in the Middle Ages," Fiorina told reporters at the event, according to ABC.∂ However, Fiorina doesn't believe in embedding U.S. troops on the ground in the Middle East. Instead, she said on ABC News's This Week With George Stephanopoulos in August the U.S. should be providing those fighting ISIS in the Middle East with the tools they've been "requesting" for years. "We really are sitting by when we could be leading a coalition of Arab allies to defeat ISIS," she said, the [Hill](http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/251237-fiorina-we-really-are-sitting-by-in-isis-fight) reported. "I think the Jordanians, the Saudis, the Kuwaitis, the Kurds and the Egyptians are all fighting ISIS as we speak on the ground."∂ "They know this is their fight," she said, according to the Hill. "Yes, they need leadership, resolve support and material from us. We haven't provided any of it. And if we did, it will make a big difference."

### Russia Scenario

#### GOP president will antagonize Russia and ramp up lethal aid to Ukraine—Clinton will continue Obama’s diplomatic approach

Menyhert 8-31-15 – Columnist of Free Russia Foundation

Kyle, U.S. – RUSSIA RELATIONS AFTER 2016: ISOLATION, ENGAGEMENT OR CONFRONTATION?, Free Russia Foundation - nonprofit, nonpartisan, nongovernmental U.S.-based organization, led by Russians abroad that seeks to be a voice for those who can’t speak under the repression of the current Russian leadership, http://www.4freerussia.org/u-s-russia-relations-after-2016-isolation-engagement-or-confrontation/

Considerable consensus is evident among the other Republican Party candidates in regards to the Ukraine crisis.¶ Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush supports supplying Kyiv with lethal aid and an increased presence of American troops in the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. His Floridian counterpart, Senator Marco Rubio, has been vocal in his support for supplying Kyiv with weapons, as well as the possibility of letting Ukraine join NATO, an ambition that Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko has expressed interest in holding a nationwide referendum for. Rubio called President Putin a “gangster”, referencing the assassinations of Aleksandr Litvinenko and Boris Nemtsov in recent remarks: “He [Putin] is basically an organized crime figure who controls a government and a large territory. … This is a person who kills people because they’re his political enemies. If you’re a political adversary of Vladimir Putin, you wind up with plutonium in your drink or shot in the street.”¶ Republican Senator Lindsey Graham is also very supportive of both arming Ukraine and bringing both Ukraine and Georgia into NATO, as well as rebuilding missile defense systems that were dismantled under the Obama Administration and is in agreement with Governor Bush in regards to an increased troop presence in the Baltic states.¶ Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin did well to explicitly mention the conflict in Ukraine during the first major GOP debate. “I would send weapons to Ukraine,” Walker said. “I would put forces on the eastern border of Poland and the Baltic nations, and I would re-instate, put back in place the missile-defense system in the Czech Republic.” Indeed, an American military convoy recently a made a public trip through the Czech Republic. The convoy saw hundreds of Czechs waving the Stars and Stripes and cheering the passing American troops.¶ Senator Ted Cruz of Texas also is supportive of sending Ukraine lethal aid, as is Ben Carson. Carson, however, was previously and publicly unaware that the Baltic states were members of NATO, raising some American political pundits’ eyebrows.¶ Governor John Kasich of Ohio has been vigorously supportive of supplying lethal aid to the Ukrainians as well. He is on record as saying “For the life of me, I cannot understand why we are not giving the Ukrainians [the ability] to defend themselves against Putin and the Russians.”¶ Despite the consensus coming across among many Republican candidates, some differences exist among the candidates specifically around Mike Huckabee and Rand Paul. While Senator Paul supports “isolating” Russia because of its aggression in Ukraine, he seems more reluctant to directly engage or supply Ukraine with aid. Mike Huckabee, once the Governor of Arkansas, is also quite wary of military escalation, instead opting to focus on economic isolation.¶ On the other side of the aisle, Hillary Clinton, the Democratic frontrunner and President Obama’s Secretary of State for many years, seems to employ more hawkish ideals than her boss. Clinton, like many of the Republican candidates, has alluded to providing greater financial and military assistance to Kyiv, but whether Clinton would sign a bill as president directly arming Ukraine is unclear. Clinton has made strong remarks about Putin, though, comparing him to Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler. She has also spoken highly of the Ukrainian government and armed forces. “I think the Ukrainian army and the Ukrainian civilians who’ve been fighting against the separatists have proven that they’re worthy of some greater support.” After many years of directly working with the president, though, it’s questionable that a Clinton Administration would do much different than the Obama Administration. Hillary may also face opposition from those who lean farther left within her own party if she becomes president.¶ If Vice President Joe Biden runs and wins the White House, the United States will have someone at the helm who is a seasoned and experienced character who has visited and met with leaders in the Baltic states and both Ukraine’s President and Prime Minister. Biden, however, probably will not waver far from Obama’s current policies, which, while they have thrown the Russian economy into considerable instability, have not visibly convinced the Kremlin to change course. Biden has also displayed more caution in regards to the War in the Donbas than Secretary Clinton or even President Obama. Farther to the left, Independent-turned-Democratic Senator Bernie Sanders has expressed interest in economic isolation but has been, like Senator Paul, very wary of military action.¶ There are over twenty candidates running for President in the United States. However, there are probably only about three courses to choose from when you boil it down regarding Ukraine and Russia. Americans can choose the status quo with Clinton (or Biden if he runs), stronger action against Putin with most of the Republicans, restrained action with Senator Paul or Senator Sanders, or uncharted isolation with Donald Trump.

#### Causes Putin to escalate with ramped up troop deployments—risks nuclear escalation

Mayer 2-5-15 – CBCNews.ca feature writer

Andre, Ukraine conflict: Why U.S. arms could lead to 'serious trouble', CBC News, http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/ukraine-conflict-why-u-s-arms-could-lead-to-serious-trouble-1.2946581

But there's a strong possibility that by arming Ukraine, the U.S. could spur Russia to unpredictable action, says John Mearsheimer, co-director of the Program on International Security Policy at the University of Chicago.¶ "People who are advocating that we up the ante by sending lethal aid to Ukraine are betting that this will cause Putin to throw up his hands and surrender," says Mearsheimer. "This is not going to happen."¶ U.S. Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, the top NATO commander, echoed this view on Thursday, saying that arming Ukraine "could trigger a more strident reaction from Russia."¶ German Chancellor Angela Merkel, for one, is opposed to arming Ukraine. She and French President Francois Hollande have drafted a new peace initiative that they are presenting in Ukraine's capital, Kyiv, on Thursday, and to Putin in Moscow on Friday.¶ Intensified fighting¶ Talk of a more concerted response from the U.S. and other NATO members comes after days of intensified fighting between Ukrainian troops and Russia-backed separatists in eastern Ukraine.¶ According to the United Nations, more than 200 people have died there in the past three weeks. It is estimated that 5,000 people have died in the conflict to date.¶ On Wednesday, heavy shelling in the rebel stronghold of Donetsk killed at least five people and damaged a hospital and several schools, according to local officials.¶ It's been almost a year since Russia annexed Crimea and Russian-backed separatists started making incursions in eastern Ukraine, and a number of western commentators say it's time for the U.S. to help Ukraine, which is no match militarily for the Russian army on its own.¶ Editorials in media outlets such as USA Today and the Washington Post say giving Ukraine lethal weapons is the only solution to this conflict.¶ Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Lukashevich said Thursday a U.S. decision to arm Ukraine would not only escalate the situation but "threatens the security of the Russian Federation."¶ U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry has said he is committed to finding a diplomatic solution, but he has also expressed concern about the increased presence of Russian tanks and artillery in rebel-held areas of Ukraine. Russia continues to deny any involvement in the conflict.¶ Stephen Blank says that up until now, all the Russian operations "have been conducted at a scale small enough so that they can pretend that they're not there," which is why NATO has been reluctant about getting involved.¶ "My belief is that if we let this go and not do what is necessary, we will face future challenges from Putin or others inspired by him," says Blank. "This has to be stopped sooner rather than later."¶ Testing Russian resolve¶ Any direct military aid from the U.S. would likely include armaments, intelligence information and "counter-battery radar," a mobile radar system that detects artillery projectiles, says William Courtney, a senior analyst at the Rand Corporation, a U.S. think tank.¶ Taras Kuzio, a senior researcher at the Canadian Institute for Ukrainian Studies, believes that if Ukraine, with the help of U.S. armaments, begins to defeat rebels on the ground, Russia would be compelled to send more of its own troops.¶ Then, Russia would no longer be in a situation of "essentially lying" about its presence on the ground, says Kuzio, because it would have to commit 50,000 to 100,000 troops.¶ He says that in this scenario, the U.S. would hope that a strengthened Ukraine army and significant casualties on the Russian side would break Putin's resolve.¶ "The American viewpoint is a bit like the 1980s, where the only way to get the Russians out of Afghanistan was to make them pay so much in terms of bodybags that eventually they say enough and they pull out, which they did," says Kuzio.¶ "We have to make the price sufficiently high for the Russians that eventually they recalculate their policies."¶ But Mearsheimer doesn't believe we will see a similar outcome in the current conflict.¶ He says Putin has already shown that economic hardships at home – such as depressed oil prices, a plunging ruble, western sanctions and the threat of a recession — are no obstacle to Russian military involvement.¶ And pressuring Putin on the battlefield will only rile him more, says Mearsheimer.¶ "Any time a great power armed with thousands of nuclear weapons is backed into a corner, you are asking for really serious trouble."

#### Extinction—comparatively the biggest impact

Baum 14 - Executive Director @ Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth Baum (Ph.D. in Geography @Pennsylvania State University and a Post-Doctoral Fellowship @ Columbia University Center for Research on Environmental Decisions), “Best And Worst Case Scenarios for Ukraine Crisis: World Peace And Nuclear War,” *Huffington Post*, May 7, 2014, http://tinyurl.com/lxx49og]

Here's the short version: The best case scenario has the Ukraine crisis being resolved diplomatically through increased Russia-Europe cooperation, which would be a big step towards world peace. The worst case scenario has the crisis escalating into nuclear war between the United States and Russia, causing human extinction.¶ Let's start with the worst case scenario, nuclear war involving the American and Russian arsenals. How bad would that be? Put it this way: Recent analysis finds that a "limited" India-Pakistan nuclear war could kill two billion people via agricultural declines from nuclear winter. This "limited" war involves just 100 nuclear weapons. The U.S. and Russia combine to possess about 16,700 nuclear weapons. Humanity may not survive the aftermath of a U.S.-Russia nuclear war.¶ It seems rather unlikely that the U.S. and Russia would end up in nuclear war over Ukraine. Sure, they have opposing positions, but neither side has anywhere near enough at stake to justify such extraordinary measures. Instead, it seems a lot more likely that the whole crisis will get resolved with a minimum of deaths. However, the story has already taken some surprising plot twists. We cannot rule out the possibility of it ending in direct nuclear war.¶ A nuclear war could also occur inadvertently, i.e. when a false alarm is misinterpreted as real, and nuclear weapons are launched in what is believed to be a counterattack. There have been several alarmingly close calls of inadvertent U.S.-Russia nuclear war over the years. Perhaps the most relevant is the 1995 Norwegian rocket incident. A rocket carrying scientific equipment was launched off northern Norway. Russia detected the rocket on its radar and interpreted it as a nuclear attack. Its own nuclear forces were put on alert and Boris Yeltsin was presented the question of whether to launch Russia's nuclear weapons in response. Fortunately, Yeltsin and the Russian General Staff apparently sensed it was a false alarm and declined to launch. Still, the disturbing lesson from this incident is that nuclear war could begin even during periods of calm.

### 1NR Climate Impact Extension

#### Extend Friedman: Hillary is key to stopping climate change—she’s constantly defended the urgency of action on warming, including proposing cap and trade policies, defending the EPA Clean Power Plan, and heading the Climate and Clean Air Coalition. The environment is a top priority for her campaign.

#### Extend Schiffman: 600 climate scientists across 32 countries agree that warming is real and anthropogenic. Causes extinction—even by conservative estimates, ocean acidification kills plankton which destroys the food chain and threatens human existence.

#### That outweighs:

#### (\_\_) Magnitude: Ocean acidification destroys the entire food chain, which kills species upon which all life depends—mass starvation and displacement of populations threatens to wipe out all life on earth.

#### (\_\_) Timeframe: Shiffman says the catastrophic impacts from climate change are only a decade away, and our time to mitigate the severity of those impacts is running out—tangible cuts to emissions are necessary in this election cycle—makes it try or die for a Clinton presidency.

#### (\_\_) Reversibility: Cascading warming and feedback loops can’t be stopped beyond critical tipping points. Intervening actors can always check risk of military conflict, but there’s no coming back from catastrophic warming.

### 1NR Clinton k2 Climate

#### Hilary best hope for climate leadership – Senate years prove energy advocacy

Drury 5/16 (Shawn Drury, senior editor of Blue Nation Review and Senior Editor MOKO Social Media, 5/16/15, ‘On Environmental Issues, Hillary Clinton is a No-Brainer Over Rivals’, BNR.com, http://bluenationreview.com/environmental-issues-hillary-clinton-brainer-rivals/, 7/5/15, ACC)

Conversely, Hillary **Clinton’s record during her eight years in the Senate should be encouraging to environmentalists**. The League of Conservation Voters issues a report card every year on members of Congress. During then-**Sen. Clinton’s time in office, she amassed a lifetime score of 82 out of 100**. As a means of comparison, current Republican Senators Ted Cruz, Lindsey Graham, Rand Paul, and Marco Rubio have lifetime scores of 11, 11, 9, and 9, respectively. There is no comparison. **While in the senate, Clinton voted to: Keep drillers out of public lands, including Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Support clean, safe, renewable energy. Protect families by ensuring water and air are clean. Seek alternatives to coal. Provide assistance for low income families for help with energy bills. The challenge for environmentalists is to push their issues up the priority list so they make it into the discussion of a general election campaign.** That would benefit Clinton, given her record, and it would help her with younger, undecided voters for whom the environment is a priority.

#### EPA key to international climate negotiations – next president determines success

Plumer 5/5 (Brad Plumer, senior editor at Vox.com, where he oversees the site's science, energy, and environmental coverage and he was previously a reporter at the Washington Post covering climate and energy policy, 5/5/15, “The next president can have a big impact on climate policy — even without Congress”, http://www.vox.com/2015/5/5/8542787/climate-change-2016-election, 7/7/15, ACC)

Where the **EPA rules could have a more important effect is on the international stage — at least in the near term. Remember, the United States only accounts for about 17 percent of worldwide greenhouse gas emissions.** **There's also China, India, Brazil, Europe, Russia, and so on.** That's why international **cooperation on climate change is so crucial**. Right now, the world is groping toward a very, very weak international agreement. **The US put forward its pledge to cut emissions at least 26 percent between 2005 and 2025. That spurred China to respond by vowing to get its emissions to peak around 2030. Other countries have started to pitch in, too.** Add all these pledges up, and we're still not close to tackling global warming. **The Climate Action Tracker estimates that we're on pace for global average temperatures to rise 3.1°C (or 5.6°F) above pre-industrial levels**, give or take — a seriously disruptive change. Even so, some experts think even these weak promises could lead, iteratively, to stronger action over time. "You can see how those plans could start to connect together and create a positive negotiating dynamic," David Victor, a political scientist at UC San Diego's School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, told me. **"The encouraging precedent here is in trade ... You build credibility and trust over time and then move to bigger issues." The next US president can help decide how this agreement continues to evolve in the years to come. The US can keep pushing its own emissions down and try to persuade countries like China and India to respond in kind. Or it could abandon this budding framework entirely.** Abandoning the US climate targets, says Wara, "would do real damage to whatever credibility the US has left on the international stage. What Obama has done with China is a big step in changing the dynamics in a very positive way. And if the US were to walk away from that, that would be very damaging for future climate negotiations and commitments."

### 1NR Trump Worse on Climate

#### Clinton is key to offset massive GOP environmental degradation—a Trump win causes deregulation and major emissions increases.

Klare 15, (Michael T. Klare is a professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, “A Republican Neo-Imperial Vision for 2016,” Feb 13, 2015, http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/keystone\_xl\_cold\_war\_20\_and\_the\_gop\_vision\_for\_2016\_20150213)

This approach has been embraced by other senior Republican figures who see increased North American hydrocarbon output as the ideal response to Russian assertiveness. In other words, the two pillars of a new energy North Americanism—enhanced collaboration with the big oil companies across the continent and reinvigorated Cold Warism—are now being folded into a single Republican grand strategy. Nothing will prepare the West better to fight Russia or just about any other hostile power on the planet than the conversion of North America into a bastion of fossil fuel abundance.¶ This strange, chilling vision of an American (and global) future was succinctly described by former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in a remarkable Washington Post op-ed in March 2014. She essentially called for North America to flood the global energy market, causing a plunge in oil prices and bankrupting the Russians. “Putin is playing for the long haul, cleverly exploiting every opening he sees,” she wrote, but “Moscow is not immune from pressure.” Putin and Co. require high oil and gas prices to finance their aggressive activities, “and soon, North America’s bounty of oil and gas will swamp Moscow’s capacity.” By “authorizing the Keystone XL pipeline and championing natural gas exports,” she asserted, Washington would signal “that we intend to do exactly that.”¶ So now you know: approval of the Keystone XL pipeline isn’t actually about jobs and the economy; it’s about battling Vladimir Putin, the Iranian mullahs, and America’s other adversaries. “One of the ways we fight back, one of the ways we push back is we take control of our own energy destiny,” said Senator Hoeven on January 7th, when introducing legislation to authorize construction of that pipeline.¶ And that, it turns out, is just the beginning of the “benefits” that North Americanism will supposedly bring. Ultimately, the goals of this strategy are to perpetuate the dominance of fossil fuels in North America’s energy mix and to enlist Canada and Mexico in a U.S.-led drive to ensure the continued dominance of the West in key regions of the world. Stay tuned: you’ll be hearing a lot more about this ambitious strategy as the Republican presidential hopefuls begin making their campaign rounds.¶ Keep in mind, though, that this is potentially dangerous stuff at every level—from the urge to ratchet up a conflict with Russia to the desire to produce and consume ever more North American fossil fuels (not exactly a surprising impulse given the Republicans’ heavy reliance on campaign contributions from Big Energy). In the coming months, the Obama administration and Hillary Clinton’s camp will, of course, attempt to counter this drive. Their efforts will, however, be undermined by their sympathy for many of its components. Obama, for instance, has boasted more than once of his success in increasing U.S. oil and gas production, while Clinton has repeatedly called for a more combative foreign policy. Nor has either of them yet come up with a grand strategy as seemingly broad and attractive as Republican North Americanism. If that plan is to be taken on seriously as the dangerous contrivance it is, it evidently will fall to others to do so.¶ This Republican vision, after all, rests on the desire of giant oil companies to eliminate government regulation and bring the energy industries of Canada and Mexico under their corporate sway. Were this to happen, it would sabotage efforts to curb carbon emissions from fossil fuels in a major way, while undermining the sovereignty of Canada and Mexico. In the process, the natural environment would suffer horribly as regulatory constraints against hazardous drilling practices would be eroded in all three countries. Stepped-up drilling, hydrofracking, and tar sands production would also result in the increased diversion of water to energy production, reducing supplies for farming while increasing the risk that leaking drilling fluids will contaminate drinking water and aquifers.¶ No less worrisome, the Republican strategy would result in a far more polarized and dangerous international environment, in which hopes for achieving any kind of peace in Ukraine, Syria, or elsewhere would disappear. The urge to convert North America into a unified garrison state under U.S. (energy) command would undoubtedly prompt similar initiatives abroad, with China moving ever closer to Russia and other blocs forming elsewhere. ¶ In addition, those who seek to use energy as a tool of coercion should not be surprised to discover that they are inviting its use by hostile parties—and in such conflicts the U.S. and its allies would not emerge unscathed. In other words, the shining Republican vision of a North American energy fortress will, in reality, prove to be a nightmare of environmental degradation and global conflict. Unfortunately, this may not be obvious by election season 2016, so watch out.

### 1NR Trump turns Gun Control

#### A Trump presidency would hollow out gun restrictions—overturns existing policies and sides with the NRA.

Scott and LoBianco 16, (Eugene Scott and Tom LoBianco, CNN Politics, “Trump: I will 'unsign' Obama executive action on gun control,” January 3, 2016, http://www.cnn.com/2016/01/02/politics/donald-trump-obama-guns/)

(CNN) Donald Trump on Saturday vowed to "unsign" President Barack Obama's plans to tighten gun control via executive action, telling a packed rally in Biloxi, Mississippi, that he would protect the right to bear arms.¶ "There's an assault on the Second Amendment. You know Obama's going to do an executive order and really knock the hell out of it," Trump said. "You know, the system's supposed to be you get the Democrats, you get the Republicans, and you make deals. He can't do that. He can't do that. So he's going to sign another executive order having to do with the Second Amendment, having to do with guns. I will veto. I will unsign that so fast."¶ Obama will meet Monday with Attorney General Loretta Lynch to discuss options for tougher gun restrictions and is expected to announce in the coming days a new executive action with the goal of expanding background checks on gun sales. Described as "imminent" by people familiar with the White House plans, the set of executive actions would fulfill a promise by the President to take further unilateral steps the administration says could help curb gun deaths.¶ Earlier Saturday, CBS released a clip of Trump denouncing Obama's plan, arguing that "a tremendous mental health problem," not guns, is the cause of America's mass shootings.¶ "I don't like it," he told CBS's John Dickerson on "Face the Nation." "I don't like anything having to do with changing our Second Amendment. We have plenty of rules and regulations. It's plenty of things they can do right now that are already there. They don't do them."¶ "We have a tremendous mental health problem," Trump continued. "We are closing places all over the world, all over the country they are closing, but they are closing all over the world."¶ He added: "All they want to do is blame the guns. And it is not the gun that pulls the trigger."¶ An excerpt of the interview was released on Saturday, and the full clip is set to air Sunday morning. Trump, who often tells supporters he's a proud member of the National Rifle Association, has regularly opposed stricter gun control laws following several mass shootings, including those in Chattanooga, Tennessee, Roseburg, Oregon, Paris and San Bernardino, California. Instead, he has suggested that by arming more people, bystanders could return fire against criminals to save lives.

### 1NR Trump turns Terrorism

#### A Trump presidency destroys effective responses to terrorism—Trump’s “Muslim equals terrorist” mentality violates civil liberties, won’t stop attacks, and causes retaliatory backlash within the US.

Sanchez 15, (Mary Sanchez, The Chicago Tribune, “Want less terrorism? Start by rejecting Trump's crusade,” December 11, 2015, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/columnists/sns-201512111230--tms--msanchezctnms-a20151211-20151211-column.html)

Since the slaughter of 14 innocents by two radicalized Muslim terrorists in San Bernardino, Calif., common sense has been a collateral casualty. Leading a wave of hysteria has been Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump, with his harebrained ideas for denying various civil liberties to Muslims.¶ None of them would pass constitutional muster, thank goodness, and while his diatribes have found fertile ground among his party’s base, the Republican establishment has begun to push back against Trump.¶ That’s good sign, because we do have a terrorism problem that requires clear thinking and sober judgment. Our actions and policies must be grounded in accurate and detailed information. A report that received relatively little press at the time of its release in early December deserves a spotlight.¶ It’s far from comforting. The main message is that there is no snapshot profile to identify the jihadist on the block. That fact alone renders much of the blather we’re hearing about restrictions on this group or that beside the point.¶ “ISIS in America: From Retweets to Raqqa” is the result of a six-month study by the Program on Extremism at George Washington University. It studied online chatter, arrest data and other information in the cases of the 71 people arrested since March 2014 for crimes related to support of the Islamic State, along with counter-terrorism research. Fifty-six were arrested in 2015, a record number in a single year since the 9/11 attacks.¶ The report asks a crucial question, in the context of students and others caught heading to Syria, intending to join the Islamic State: “How could these seemingly ordinary young American men and, in growing numbers, women, be attracted to the world’s most infamous terrorist organization?” The answer is that we don’t know, “as each individual’s radicalization has its own unique dynamics.”¶ Average age of those studied was 26, but they ranged in age from 15 to 47; 86 percent were male, and most were U.S. citizens or permanent residents.¶ Another point that might surprise those who obsessed with Islamic immigrants: Converts to the faith were 40 percent of the people arrested.¶ In some ways, the study proved to be a bit prophetic about San Bernardino. It noted a decrease in the numbers traveling to join the Islamic State overseas, which raises the possibility that homegrown terrorists will increasingly focus on U.S. targets.¶ At less than 1 percent of the total adult population, Muslims in America are at a disadvantage with respect to public perception. Many Americans literally don’t know a single one of the estimated 1.8 million adults in the U.S. who are Muslim.¶ Assimilation and acceptance, as opposed to isolation, the report notes, are key to blocking radicalization. That’s actually a hopeful point we can look to. Despite the caustic debates about Islam playing out in our media of late, America’s Muslims are far more integrated than their coreligionists in many European countries. That’s a huge strength — and one that should not be undermined.¶ About 63 percent of Muslims in the U.S. are immigrants. They are also more likely to hold a college degree than native-born citizens, and Muslim women stand out for educational attainment.¶ They’re an asset to our nation, and it’s in everybody’s interest, in the measures we take to protect ourselves from terrorism, not to alienate them.¶ If American citizens are truly to follow the “if you see something, say something” mode of alertness, we need to be knowledgeable. A mentality of Muslim-equals-terrorist will not help keep us safe.

### Trump Precautionary Principle

#### You have an ethical obligation to reject discourses that justify a Trump presidency—causes racism, xenophobia and a new age of totalitarianism that threatens the planet.

Giroux 3/16, (Henry A. Giroux currently is the McMaster University Professor for Scholarship in the Public Interest and The Paulo Freire Distinguished Scholar in Critical Pedagogy, “Henry A. Giroux | Why Are Liberal Commentators Acting as Apologists for Trump's Racism?” March 16, 2016, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35240-why-are-liberal-commentators-acting-as-apologists-for-trump-s-racism)

What is disturbing about accounts that celebrate, however cautiously, Trump's more liberal tendencies is that, in the words of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, "they give racist contempt the impeccable alibi of ethical and secular legitimacy." This type of restricted discourse runs the risk of absolving the Republican Party and Trump and his followers of some of their most vile, right-wing, nativist legacies. These liberal cover-ups do more than underplay Trump's fascist tendencies; they also overlook a moment in which political authoritarianism is on the rise and in which the very fate of humanity and the planet are at risk. As Los Angeles Times reporters Don Lee and Kurtis Lee observe:¶ If Donald Trump were president, [he would end abortion rights, repeal Obamacare,] put U.S. ground troops in Iraq to fight Islamic extremists, rescind President Obama's executive orders that protect millions of immigrants from deportation, eliminate American citizenship for U.S.-born children whose parents are in the country illegally and "police" but not necessarily revoke the nuclear pact with Iran. Trump wants to deport all immigrants in the U.S. illegally -- an estimated 11 million people -- but says he wouldn't break up families because their families would be deported too. "We're going to keep the families together ... but they have to go," he said in a wide-ranging interview on NBC's "Meet the Press." "We have to make a whole new set of standards. And when people come in, they have to come in legally." Deportees who qualify could return, he said. Trump would end Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which allows young people brought to the country illegally as children to work and attend college without facing deportation.¶ Trump's toxic racism and discourse has been leading to violence for some time. According to an August 2015 article in Rolling Stone by Matt Taibbi, when two brothers from South Boston urinated on and severely beat with a metallic pipe a Latino man, "one of the brothers reportedly told police that 'Donald Trump was right, all of these illegals need to be deported.'"¶ Taibbi adds:¶ When reporters confronted Trump, he hadn't yet heard about the incident. At first, he said, "That would be a shame." But right after, he went on: "I will say, the people that are following me are very passionate. They love this country. They want this country to be great again. But they are very passionate. I will say that."¶ Trump later modified his response, one that both appeared to condone and legitimate the violence done in his name, but the fact remains that he is disseminating hate and creating the conditions for dangerous ideas to mobilize real-life violence in a society seething with a toxic disdain for immigrants. In what can only be interpreted as an openly racist justification for such violence -- reminiscent of similar attacks against Jews in Nazi Germany -- Trump's initial response truly reflects the degree to which right-wing extremism has become an acceptable register of US politics.¶ The authoritarian tendencies of Trump's followers cannot be explained through economic analyses alone. Denying the importance of racism, xenophobia, corporate-driven public pedagogies and a culture shaped by the financial elite greatly ignores modes of domination that go far beyond economic discontents and are produced and legitimated daily in mainstream cultural apparatuses. As Ellen Willis has pointed out, domination is not simply structural -- it takes shape through beliefs, persuasion, rhetoric and the pedagogical dimensions of politics. What Trump has tapped into is not simply economic resentment but also decades of a formative culture that is as divisive as it is anti-democratic. Violence is ubiquitous in US society and has become normalized, furthering a politics of anxiety, uncertainty and bigotry.¶ Trump has taken advantage of a proliferating culture of fear to create what Susan Sontag has described as a mimicry of fascinating fascism that trades in a carnival of violence and hatred. This spectacle furthers a politics of nihilism and brings many Americans closer to the abyss of proto-fascism. Under such circumstances, it is fair to argue that many of Trump's supporters have embraced the core elements of totalitarian politics. In this instance, politics has become a staged event, a spectacle that both normalizes violence and makes it a source of pleasure.¶ Trump echoes a fascist script that has been updated to address the fears and anxieties of people who feel betrayed by mainstream politics and channel their anger toward immigrants, Black people and anyone they deem un-American. Given the way in which racism mixes with the growing fear and anger over economic precariousness of working-class white people in this country, is it any wonder, that Trump presents himself as the strong leader, the mythic strongman offering redemption, revenge and a revitalized white Christian United States? Trump is not only the new face of proto-fascism, but also the logical end result of neoliberal capitalism's numerous assaults on democracy itself.

### Warming Turns Case—Economy

#### Warming turns economic growth—costs 20% of world GDP every year.

CBS News, 2/11/2009, “U.K. Report: Warming Will Destroy Economy," <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/10/30/world/main2136061.shtml> (searched “warming destroys economy”)

Unchecked global warming will devastate the world economy on the scale of the world wars and the Great Depression, a British government report said Monday, as the country launched a bid to convince doubters that environmentalism and economic growth can coincide. Britain hired former Vice President Al Gore, who has emerged as a powerful environmental spokesman since his defeat in the 2000 presidential election, to advise the government on climate change — a clear indication of Prime Minister Tony Blair's dissatisfaction with current U.S. policy. Blair, President Bush's top ally in the Iraq war, said unabated climate change would eventually cost the world between 5 percent and 20 percent of global gross domestic product each year. He called for "bold and decisive action" to cut carbon emissions and stem the worst of the temperature rise. "It is not in doubt that, if the science is right, the consequences for our planet are literally disastrous," he said. "This disaster is not set to happen in some science fiction future many years ahead, but in our lifetime." The report emphasized that global warming can only be fought with the cooperation of major countries such as the United States and China, and represents a huge contrast to the Bush administration's wait-and-see global warming policies. Sir Nicholas Stern, the senior government economist who wrote the report, said that acting now to cut greenhouse gas emissions would cost about 1 percent of global GDP each year. He recommended a "low-carbon global economy" through measures including taxation, regulation of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon trading. Pay now or pay a lot more later — that's the report's stark conclusion, reports CBS News correspondent Mark Phillips. President Bush kept America — by far the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide and other gases blamed for global warming — out of the Kyoto international treaty to reduce greenhouse gases, saying the pact would harm the U.S. economy. The international agreement was reached in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997 and expires in 2012. Blair made his displeasure with U.S. environmental policy clear when he signed an agreement this year with California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger to develop new technologies to combat the problem. The measure imposed the first emissions cap in the United States on utilities, refineries and manufacturing plants in a bid to curb the gases that scientists blame for warming the Earth. The prime minister and the report also said that no matter what Britain, the United States and Japan do, the battle against global warming cannot succeed without deciding when and how to control the greenhouse gas emissions by such fast-industrializing giants as China and India. Stern's 700-page report said evidence showed "that ignoring climate change will eventually damage economic growth." "Our actions over the coming decades could create risks of major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and in the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and the economic depression of the first half of the 20th century," he said. The British hope this new economic argument can do what environmental arguments haven't: convince skeptical governments in China and the United States to act now as well, reports Phillips.

### Warming Turns Case—War

#### Warming is a threat magnifier—environmental degradation makes existing tensions erupt into conflict and independently starts new wars.

Arthur Max, writer for Associated Press, 2/15/2011, "UN climate chief warns warming can cause conflict,” INTERNATIONAL NEWS section, Lexis (searched warming causes conflict)

Global warming is a looming threat to stability and national security around the world, and militaries should spend some of their ever-expanding budgets on reducing carbon emissions to avoid "climate chaos," the U.N.'s top climate official said Tuesday. Christiana Figueres, head of the U.N. climate secretariat, warned of the destabilizing effects created by growing water stress, declining crop yields and damage from extreme storms in some of the world's poorest countries, which could set off mass international migration and regional conflicts. Figueres said the world's military budgets grew by 50 percent in the first nine years of this century. Rather than continue that growth in weaponry, she said, the generals should invest in preventative budgets to "avoid the climate chaos that would demand a defense response that makes even today's spending burden look light." She was speaking to Spanish legislators at the national defense college in Madrid. Her remarks were distributed by her office in Bonn, Germany. Scientists and defense think tanks have warned for years of the heightened military risks created by global warming. In 2007, the U.N. panel of climate scientists said hundreds of millions of Africans will face persistent drought and food insecurity over the next decades that could prompt many to abandon ancestral homes. Other U.N. academics reported last year that in 2008 alone 20 million people were displaced by sudden climate disasters, at least temporarily, and gradual climate changes over the next 40 years could cause 200 million people and perhaps up to 1 billion to migrate. Figueres said much of the funding that pays for the growth of armies today could help curb carbon emissions that fuel global warming. It also could help poor countries in the most vulnerable and unstable parts of the world to protect themselves from the most devastating effects of climate change. Militaries should pursue their historic role as technology innovators, she said. "This is an opportunity for the military industry to become the cutting edge of clean technologies that are urgently needed." She cited estimates by the U.S. Defense Department that it costs $400 per gallon to supply gasoline to NATO military forces in Afghanistan, and protecting the fuel convoys is a major cause of casualties. Some military bases have begun using solar power to help cut the need to truck in liquid fuels, but the experiments are limited.
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## AT Elections

### Trump Wins General Election

#### Trump wins now—his centrist positions and willingness to dig up scandals beat Clinton.

Rahn 4/28, (Will Rahn is a political correspondent and managing director, politics, for CBS News Digital, “Commentary: Yes, Donald Trump can beat Hillary Clinton,” April 28, 2016, http://www.cbsnews.com/news/yes-trump-can-beat-hillary-clinton/)

So back to Trump, who still has a few things going for him. His general election strategy, such as it is, seems to be predicated on two strategies: pivot left as far as possible and launch a scorched earth campaign against Clinton.¶ Let's look at these one at a time. On the face of it, insulting your way to the presidency seems like a stupid, unworkable idea. Then again, Clinton has shown herself vulnerable to attacks on her character, not to mention her husband's.¶ The reaction to Rosario Dawson's in-passing reference to Monica Lewinsky over the weekend shows how sensitive the Clinton camp is to such things. Lewinsky is a sympathetic figure wrapped up in a sympathetic cause; Dawson only said that she agrees with her anti-bullying efforts. And yet still there were calls for Dawson to get off the trail for Bernie Sanders, that she had somehow crossed a line just by mouthing the word "Monica."¶ What happens when Trump, after Hillary inevitably accuses him of sexism, says that Bill is a rapist, a serial assaulter of women, and that she is his enabler? What happens when he incorporates this into his stump speech? The upside, if you can call it that, to Trump's refusal to act "presidential" is that he is the only candidate who will go that far. Trump, and Trump alone, is the only candidate who would not only resurrect all the Clinton sex scandals, but make them a centerpiece of his campaign. It could backfire, sure. But the fact is we have no idea how Trump dredging up all this will play, particularly among the younger voters Hillary will be somewhat dependent on. We don't know how Americans who've grown up marinating in discussions of rape culture, who watched the Cosby and Catholic and Dr. Luke scandals unfold, would respond to the renewed visibility of someone like Juanita Broaddrick.¶ And that's just the sex stuff. The Clintons are no strangers to scandals financial and otherwise, and while bringing up all that baggage, in some cases discredited, would seem too-low for a normal candidate, Trump will almost certainly embrace all of it.¶ Hillary's weak points aside, Trump also has one main advantage, which is that he'd be probably the most moderate nominee in decades. Now, Trump is not normally what we think of when we think of moderates - "reactionary moderate" is perhaps the best term to describe him. But border walls and Muslim bans aside, Trump really most closely resembles an old-school northeastern centrist Republican. Trump likes the welfare state. He's made protecting entitlements central to his pitch. It's safe to say that he's likely, at heart, socially liberal -- the story of how he became anti-abortion, for example, doesn't make a great deal of sense. (That story, in brief: friends of his debated having an abortion. They did not. The kid turned out to be "a winner." When pressed if he would have stayed pro-abortion if the kid was a loser, Trump once replied "probably not.")¶ He clearly doesn't like these "Bathroom Bills" popping up in red states; bad for business, and that's always Trump's bottom line. Regardless of what he says in the lead-up to next week's Indiana primary, that probably goes for RFRAs as well. And given the milieu he's always existed in, it's hard to believe he really opposes gay marriage, either.¶ Trump has had the benefit of never really fleshing out what he believes about specific policies; nearly a year into his campaign, we still don't know what he'd replace Obamacare with. He is, as his longtime advisor Roger Stone says, a "big picture" guy: pro-business, pro-military, pro-America. The rest is all open to negotiation, to making the best deal.¶ And, as Jim Antle notes over at The Washington Examiner, that puts him pretty squarely into the vast middle of the American electorate. "The New American Center", as NBC News recently called it, is patriotic. It thinks America is the best country in the world. But it hates our political system and our elites. It doesn't like immigration or Affirmative Action or other programs explicitly designed to help minorities.¶ It is, in other words, Trump's natural base, at least on paper. Now, there are still plenty of reasons why someone who agrees with Trump on a whole mess of issues might still be unwilling to vote for him. But it's a mistake to assume that the man doesn't have a natural constituency outside the GOP.

#### Trump is narrowing the gap against Hillary in general election polls—he can swing Republicans to win the Presidency.

Goodman 4/26, (Bonnie K. Goodman, The Examiner, “Trump hits 50 percent support virtually tied with Clinton in general election,” April 26, 2016, http://www.examiner.com/article/trump-hits-50-percent-support-virtually-tied-with-clinton-general-election)

Donald Trump is becoming closer to becoming the Republican Party's presumptive nominee in every way in the delegate count and support. According to a new NBC News|SurveyMonkey Weekly Election Tracking Poll released on Tuesday, April 26, 2016, Trump reached 50 support for the first time in the campaign. Additionally, Trump is now within only three points of Democratic frontrunner Hillary Clinton in a general election matchup according to a new George Washington University Battleground Poll released on Monday, April 25.¶ In the new NBC News|SurveyMonkey Weekly Election Tracking Poll, Trump has 50 percent support up four percent in the last week. In second place is Texas Senator Ted Cruz with 26 percent down two points, and in third Ohio Governor John Kasich with 17 percent support down two points.¶ Trump has less support from registered Republican with 49 percent still that number is up six points from last week's 43 percent support. NBC News indicates, "This 6-point gain is important, as Trump usually does well among independents, but has struggled to win over more traditional Republicans so far." Both Cruz and Kasich are losing support among Republicans with 28 and 15 percent respectively.¶ Meanwhile, Trump is also gaining steam in his potential general election campaign against Democratic frontrunner Clinton. Trump is narrowing the once 10 percent or more gap he faced in similar polls against Clinton. According to the George Washington University Battleground Poll Trump has 43 percent to Clinton 46 percent support.

#### Trump wins now—he only needs 25% of African American voters to win the presidency and can win over enough who are dissatisfied with Obama.

Simon 4/27, (Roger L Simon, PJ Media, “How Trump Can Win the Black Vote to Win the Election,” April 27, 2016, https://pjmedia.com/diaryofamadvoter/2016/04/27/how-trump-can-win-the-black-vote-to-win-the-election/)

In the welter of cable commentary over Donald Trump's overwhelming victories in the so-called "Acela primary" Tuesday, among the most startling was an aside by CNN's Van Jones that Trump could win the election if he got just 25% of the black vote. Now this didn't make the African-American activist who co-founded and is the current president of Dream Corps, a “social justice accelerator,” particularly happy. Nor did or does it please BET's Tavis Smiley, who has made similar mention of Trump's possible inroads in the black community. But it's true.¶ Donald Trump really could win the general election by being the first Republican in years to gain a significant percentage of the African-American vote. He just has to make a serious and sustained effort, with genuine proposals, to do it. If the attempt is simply self-referential bluster (like bragging about the actually paltry number of Hispanics who voted for him in Nevada) coupled with unspecified pledges of "greatness," he might as well not bother. It will end up a disheartening misfire that will not only be an insult to his supporters but a continuing -- and worsening -- wound to our country.¶ Nevertheless, the auguries for Trump in this area are extremely good, certainly the best in recent years for a Republican, if he should choose to act upon them. And for the sake of all Americans, he should. In fact, he'd better.¶ The African-American community is in a miserable condition that has been getting worse for decades and has reached its nadir under Obama -- two-parent families disappearing, unemployment rates skyrocketing, incarceration rates catastrophic, drug addiction epidemic. We all look on in despair as gang members shoot children in the streets of Chicago and murders -- almost all black-on-black -- proliferate in Baltimore after years of decline.¶ What is to be done about all this? Hillary Clinton will certainly have plenty to say, but it will all be the same old disingenuous bilge. She can't be part of the solution because she -- like the Democratic Party she has served loyally for almost her entire life -- is part of the problem.

#### Trump beats Clinton—he’ll pivot better to moderates for the general election.

Delamaide 4/29, (Darrell Delamaide, Political Columnist for MarketWatch, “Opinion: The new Donald Trump can beat Hillary Clinton,” April 29, 2016, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-new-donald-trump-can-beat-hillary-clinton-2016-04-29)

The makeover that began with Trump’s uncharacteristically short and concise victory speech after the New York primary is in full swing, with the aim of transforming the rowdy, rambling brawler of the primaries into a distinguished statesman capable of taking on the most powerful political office in the world.¶ It could work.¶ After all, Theodore White’s best-selling “Making of the President” series, which began with his chronicle of John Kennedy’s successful 1960 run, soon became Joe McGinnis’s “The Selling of the President” about the equally successful packaging and marketing of candidate Richard Nixon in 1968.¶ And who is better at marketing and branding than Donald Trump?¶ The Democrats are in more trouble than they realize proceeding with their rigged effort to crown Hillary Clinton as their nominee.¶ Who really thinks it’s a good idea to field a candidate with that much baggage and with a 56% unfavorable rating?¶ The Democratic Party bosses take comfort that Trump’s negatives are even higher, thus logically pointing to a Clinton victory in this war of attrition.¶ But, as Clinton herself constantly proclaims, she is the battle-scarred veteran of the trenches, and her favorability ratings are likely to move much more sluggishly.¶ Trump is new to this game and his ratings are more fluid. There is every reason to expect that as he pivots to a new look and demeanor, his favorability rating will improve.¶ As for the content of that foreign-policy speech, the mainstream media predictably found it “incoherent” and full of “paradoxes.” As if the foreign policy followed by President Barack Obama and his erstwhile secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, was a resounding example of coherence.¶ There is actually a good deal of internal coherence in Trump’s analysis of America’s place in the world and his policies, and it fits in well with the general themes of his campaign. Read the speech and judge for yourself.¶ “America First,” like “Make America Great Again,” has considerable resonance with a wide swath of voters through any number of swing states that Trump could well move into his column in a general election. (Sorry, pundits, no one really cares if the expression was first used by Nazi sympathizer Charles Lindbergh in the 1930s.)¶ And let’s look at the widely touted impact on the down ticket — that aversion to Trump will swing a number of contested Senate seats to the Democrats and enable them to regain control of the Senate while making considerable gains in the House.¶ That may be too optimistic, especially considering that the trend under Obama has been for the party to lose ground.¶ Data from University of Virginia analyst Larry Sabato published this week in the Washington Post showed that Obama set new standards in this regard.¶ Democrats have lost a net 11 governorships during his tenure, as well as 13 Senate seats, 69 House seats, and control of 32 (!) state legislative chambers — far more in every case than Republicans under that party’s presidents and mostly more than other Democrats have lost.¶ Why should Democrats gain under Clinton’s standard after she has wrapped herself in the “success” of the Obama administration?¶ The Democratic Party leadership is for the most part geriatric and sclerotic, and even the feisty independent trying to win a new generation to progressive policies is 74.¶ Conceivably, Hillary Clinton could do a pivot of her own and wholeheartedly embrace the policies championed by Bernie Sanders, which have generated so much of the energy and enthusiasm in the Democratic primaries.¶ No matter how convincingly Sanders endorses Clinton once she has actually won the nomination, it is not his responsibility to keep that enthusiasm alive. The ability to generate enthusiasm is nontransferable and if Clinton wants to keep those voters, especially young people who would be voting for the first time, it is up to her to motivate them to go to the polls.¶ She has shown little inclination so far to do that, apparently confident that she has the “Obama coalition” well enough in hand to win the election and that organization will do the rest.¶ But it won’t be fear and loathing of Trump that gets these young people to the polls. It is Trump who is making the more successful opening to the center, with his support for Medicare and Social Security and his opposition to trade pacts.¶ He, too, could promise some relief for student debt along with his raising hopes of more and better jobs.¶ These young voters aren’t bogged down in the past. They don’t care if someone calls himself a socialist, and they certainly won’t care that Charles Lindbergh was the first to use the expression “America First.”¶ Hillary Clinton, as Wall Street Journal columnist Daniel Henninger noted this week, is much likelier to pivot now to the halcyon days of President Bill Clinton, perhaps throwing Obama under the bus now that he has served his purpose of winning her the nomination.¶ But for many of these young voters, the first Clinton administration is something they read about in history books, and it would be hard to overestimate the degree of Clinton fatigue among older voters.¶ We’ll see who does a better job of packaging and selling, but it would be premature to count on seeing a second President Clinton.

### UQ Overwhelms

#### No chance of a Trump victory—Clinton crushes him and it’s not close.

Glueck 4/29, (Katie Glueck, Politico, Insiders: Clinton would crush Trump in November, April 29, 2016, http://www.politico.com/story/2016/04/hillary-clinton-donald-trump-november-insiders-222598)

In the swing states that matter most in the presidential race, Donald Trump doesn’t have a prayer against Hillary Clinton in the general election.¶ That’s according to top operatives, strategists and activists in 10 battleground states who participated in this week’s POLITICO Caucus. Nearly 90 percent of them said Clinton would defeat Trump in their home states in a November matchup.¶ Republicans are only slightly more bullish on Trump’s prospects than Democrats: More than three-quarters of GOP insiders expect Clinton to best the Republican front-runner in a general-election contest in their respective states. Among Democrats, the belief is nearly universal: 99 percent of surveyed said will Clinton will beat Trump.¶ In three of the biggest swing states — Ohio, Pennsylvania and Florida — Republicans were particularly downbeat about the prospect of a Trump-Clinton contest.¶ “There is positively no way for Trump to win in Pennsylvania,” said a Republican from that state.¶ “Trump cannot and will not carry Ohio,” a Republican from that state insisted. “He will do well in Appalachia and in the Mahoning Valley, but he will get killed in the rest of the state. The danger for the GOP is losing Rob Portman, which is a very real possibility under this matchup.”¶ Added a Florida Republican, who like all participants was granted anonymity in order to speak freely, “Trump is grinding the GOP to a stub. He couldn't find enough xenophobic, angry white Floridians to beat Hillary in Florida if he tried.”¶ “I not only think [Hillary] will win Florida in November if Trump is the nominee, I think she'll win 30+ states,” said another Florida Republican.¶ These comments follow two weeks of victories for Trump, who notched a major win in New York before going on to sweep the mid-Atlantic states on Tuesday.¶ Looking ahead to the general election, Republican insiders fretted that if Trump is at the top of the ticket, he will not only lose in a landslide, but will also endanger Republicans on the rest of the ballot.

#### Electoral college predictions show Clinton beats Trump by 100 votes.

Smith 4/13, (Allan Smith, Business Insider, A new electoral-map model finds Hillary Clinton crushing Donald Trump and Ted Cruz, April 13, 2016, http://www.businessinsider.com/polls-hillary-clinton-trump-ted-cruz-john-kasich-map-2016-4)

An Electoral College projection released Wednesday from Morning Consult found that Hillary Clinton would secure massive victories in the general election against either Donald Trump or Ted Cruz, the two most likely Republican presidential nominees.¶ But the analysis also showed that Clinton, the former secretary of state and Democratic frontrunner, would suffer a defeat at the hands of John Kasich, the Ohio governor.¶ The study, which surveyed more than 44,000 registered voters across all 50 states, showed that Clinton would have the advantage in nearly every Midwestern swing state against Trump, the GOP frontrunner, and Cruz, the Texas senator nipping at his heels.¶ But the analysis suggested that Kasich had the potential to flip the script in those states. The study showed Kasich holding leads in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, all states his fellow remaining Republicans were projected to lose.¶ The map was nearly identical for both Trump and Cruz, with Trump picking up an additional four votes for winning Maine. (Maine, however, has voted reliably for Democratic candidates in every presidential election since 1988.)¶ Morning Consult, a polling, consulting, and technology firm, surveyed the more than 44,000 voters in all 50 states over a four-month period. The company combined those results with other factors like voter demographics and economic data to forecast an overall outcome in each state.¶ Clinton would edge out Trump and Cruz by more than 100 electoral votes, the analysis found. A candidate needs to secure 270 electoral votes to win the presidency.

#### Clinton wins in a landslide, even with Obama approval ratings priced in.

The Week 3/31, (The Week, “These election experts are predicting a Hillary Clinton landslide over Donald Trump,” March 31, 2016, http://theweek.com/speedreads/615901/election-experts-are-predicting-hillary-clinton-landslide-over-donald-trump)

Donald Trump likes to brag that polls show him beating Hillary Clinton in a head-to-head matchup, even though the opposite is true in most surveys. But polls this early out aren't particularly useful for predicting what will happen in November, not least because neither Clinton nor Trump has secured their party's nomination. More to the point, polls reflect the popular vote. "Here at Crystal Ball," note political prognosticator Larry Sabato and his colleagues, "we are going to cling to one central fact about presidential elections: The only thing that matters is accumulating a majority of 270 votes in the Electoral College."¶ Last May, Sabato and his team at the University of Virginia created a generic Democrat-versus-Republican map that predicted a close election, but now that Clinton and Trump are the likely nominees, they adjusted the map accordingly. The new map "does not show a close and competitive general election," write Sabato, Kyle Kondik, and Geoffrey Skelley. Sabato's team leaves a healthy amount of wiggle room for the "unexpected twists and turns" sure to come, including "the shape of the economy or terrorism, or the precise job approval rating of President Obama in the autumn, or the gaffes and scandals that may yet unfold," calling their electoral map an "extra-early, ridiculously premature projection." (You can read more about their methodology and assumptions at Sabato's Crystal Ball.) But they aren't going out on the Clinton-landslide limb alone: Nate Silver @NateSilver538 Here's what the map might look like in an election held today.